arXiv:1405.3336v3 [math.RT] 17 Mar 2015

AUSLANDER-REITEN QUIVER OF TYPE A AND THE GENERALIZED QUANTUM AFFINE SCHUR-WEYL DUALITY

SE-JIN OH

Abstract. The quiver Hecke algebra R can be also understood as a generalization of the affine Hecke algebra of type A in the context of the quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality by the results of Kang, Kashiwara and Kim. On the other hand, it is well-known that the Auslander-Reiten(AR) quivers Γ_Q of finite simply-laced types have a deep relation with the positive roots systems of the corresponding types. In this paper, we present explicit combinatorial descriptions for the AR-quivers Γ_Q of finite type A. Using the combinatorial descriptions, we can investigate relations between finite dimensional module categories over the quantum affine algebra $U_q'(A_n^{(i)})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and finite dimensional graded module categories over the quiver Hecke algebra R_{A_n} associated to A_n through the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor.

Introduction

Let Δ_n be a rank n Dynkin diagram of finite type A, D or E, and Q be a Dynkin quiver by orienting edges of Δ_n. Gabriel's theorem [18] states that isomorphism classes of indecomposables of the category of modules mod$\mathbb{C}Q$ over the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$ are labeled by the set of positive roots Φ_n^+ related to Δ_n.

The Auslander-Reiten quiver (AR-quiver) Γ_Q arising from Q encodes the structure of the mod$\mathbb{C}Q$ in the following sense: (i) vertices of AR-quiver present the indecomposables, (ii) arrows present the irreducible morphisms between them. Moreover, Γ_Q itself provides reduced expressions of the longest element w_0 of the Weyl group associated with Δ_n by reading the levels of vertices in Γ_Q in a manner compatible with paths [5]. The AR-quiver also plays an important role in the research area of cluster algebras, cluster-tilted algebras and cluster categories (for example, [13]).

For each reduced expression $\tilde{w}_0$ of w_0, we can assign a total order $<_{\tilde{w}_0}$ on Φ_n^+ by [8, Chapter VI, §1.6]. Moreover, the total order is *convex* in the sense that for any $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\alpha+\beta \in \Phi_n^+$, we have that $\alpha <_{\tilde{w}_0} \beta$ implies $\alpha <_{\tilde{w}_0} \alpha+\beta <_{\tilde{w}_0} \beta$ ([46]). By abstracting this

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05E10, 16T30, 17B37; Secondary 81R50.

Key words and phrases. Auslander-Reiten quiver, quiver Hecke algebra, generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality.

concept, we say a partial order $\prec$ on Φ_n^+ convex if $\alpha+\beta\in\Phi_n^+$ implies either $\alpha\prec\alpha+\beta\prec\beta$ or $\beta\prec\alpha+\beta\prec\alpha$ (see §1.3).

On the other hand, Hernandez and Leclerc [22] defined certain category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ which consists of finite dimensional integrable modules over quantum affine algebras $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$, and depends on the AR-quiver Γ_Q. They proved that $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ categorifies $\mathbb{C}[N]$ the coordinate ring of the unipotent group N associated with $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Here $\mathfrak{g}$ is affine Kac-Moody algebra of untwisted simply laced type and $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the finite dimensional semisimple Lie subalgebra inside $\mathfrak{g}$.

The quiver Hecke algebras $R_\mathfrak{g}$, introduced by Khovanov-Lauda [38, 39] and Rouquier [48], categorify the negative part of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ for all symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras $\mathfrak{g}$. Since $R_\mathfrak{g}$ provides quantum versions of Lascoux-Leclerc-Thibon-Ariki theory ([2, 41]), many authors study the representation theories on quiver Hecke algebras $R_\mathfrak{g}$ very actively since its introduction (for example, [10, 11, 24, 26, 31, 42, 49]). In particular, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite classical semisimple Lie algebra, the theory on the construction of simple modules over $R_\mathfrak{g}$ is well-developed (see [6, 12, 23, 32, 37, 40, 43]). Among these results, the approach of [37, 40, 43] provides the way of constructing simple modules over $R_\mathfrak{g}$ by using PBW-bases which are arisen from a convex order induced by a fixed reduced expression $\tilde{w}_0$ of w_0.

Note that, for $\mathfrak{g}_0$ inside $\mathfrak{g}$, the specialization of the integral form $U_\mathbb{A}^-(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ at $q=1$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[N]$ and hence $U_\mathbb{A}^-(\mathfrak{g}_0)|_{q=1}$ is categorified via $R_{\mathfrak{g}_0}$ (with forgetting grading) and $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ over $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$, simultaneously. Since the result of Brundan and Kleshchev in [10] provides the isomorphism between affine Hecke algebras of type A and the $R_{A_n^{(1)}}$ up to a specialization and a localization, Hernandez and Leclerc expected that quiver Hecke algebras might be interpreted as a generalization of affine Hecke algebra of type A in the context of the quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality ([14, 15, 19]).

In [27, 28], Kang, Kashiwara and Kim came up with an answer for the expectation. They constructed the *generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor*

$$\mathcal{F}:\mathrm{Rep}(R_J)\to\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$$

between the finite dimensional integrable modules category $\mathscr{C}_\mathfrak{g}$ over $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ and the category $\mathrm{Rep}(R_J)$ of finite dimensional graded modules over quiver Hecke algebra R_J, by observing the zeros of denominator of *normalized R-matrix* $R_{k,l}^{\mathrm{norm}}(z)$. Their work can be understood as a graded generalization of quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality since $\mathrm{Rep}(R_J)$ has a grading. Here R_J is defined by the quiver Q_J, which appears in the process of constructing $\mathcal{F}$. Interestingly, R_J does depend on the *choice* of *good* modules over $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$.

By the results of [27, 28] and [22], we have an exact functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ from $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{\mathfrak{g}_0})$ to $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ over $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$

$$\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}:\mathrm{Rep}(R_{\mathfrak{g}_0})\to\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$$

which sends simples to simples, for

(a) each Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A (resp. D),
(b) $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_n^{(1)}$ (resp $D_n^{(1)}$) and $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is of type A_n (resp. D_n).

In this paper, we investigate $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ more deeply by using the explicit combinatorial description of an AR-quiver Γ_Q which arises from a chosen Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A.

Note that all vertices in Γ_Q are labeled by the set of positive roots Φ_n^+ and each positive root β in Φ_n^+ of finite type A can be expressed by the segment $[a,b]$, where $\beta = \sum_{k=a}^{b} \alpha_a$. We say a the first component of β and b the second one. Identifying β with $[a,b]$, Γ_Q satisfies the following property: Every positive root appearing in the *maximal N-sectional* (resp. *S-sectional*) path in Γ_Q has the same first (resp. second) component (Theorem 1.11). With this property, the facts

(i) $\Phi_n^+ = \{[a,b] \mid 1 \le a \le b \le n\}$,
(ii) we know the position of simple roots in Γ_Q by [28, Lemma 3.2.2]

provides a way (Remark 1.14) for computing the bijection

$$\phi^{-1} : \Phi_n^+ \times \{0\} \longrightarrow \Gamma_Q$$

without using *the Coxeter element τ adapted Q* and *the additive property of the dimension vectors*.

The description of $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ (Definition 2.2) is the smallest category containing $V_Q(\beta)$ for $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ and stable by certain operations on modules, where

$$V_Q(\beta) := V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p} \text{ is the fundamental } U_q'(A_n^{(1)})\text{-modules for } \phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (i,p).$$

Using the combinatorial descriptions of Γ_Q, we can prove that the *Dorey's rule* in [14] always holds for every $\alpha \prec_Q \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$; i.e., the following surjective homomorphisms exist:

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma),$$

where $\prec_Q$ is *the convex partial order arising from* Γ_Q and the simple R_{A_n}-module $S_Q(\beta)$ is the preimage of $V_Q(\beta)$ under the functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ (Theorem 3.2).

Moreover, we prove that every pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in (\Phi_n^+)^2$ with $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ is indeed a *minimal pair* in the sense of McNamara [43], with respect a suitable total order which is compatible with the convex partial order $\prec_Q$ (Theorem 3.4). Thus, for every pair (α, β) with $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$, we have (Corollary 3.7)

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \text{ and } S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \text{ have composition length 2.}$$

In [1, 35], it is proved that every finite dimensional simple integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module M appears as a simple head of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{l} V(\varpi_{i_k})_{a_k}$ for some finite sequence

$$((i_1,a_1),\dots,(i_l,a_l)) \text{ in } (\{1,\dots,n\}\times \mathbf{k}^\times)^l$$

such that the normalized R-matrices $R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{i_k,i_{k'}}(z)$ have no pole at $z = a_{k'}/a_k$, for all $1 \le k < k' \le l$. Here, $\mathbf{k} = \overline{\mathbb{C}(q)} \subset \cup_{m>0}\mathbb{C}((q^{1/m}))$. With this theorem and the denominators in [44, Appendix A], we can construct various exact sequences and simple modules over R_{A_n}-modules, which can be understood as generalizations of the exact sequences and simple modules in [28, Proposition 4.2.3] and [32] (see Section 4). We also obtain an alternative proof for the exactness of $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ (Theorem 4.9). Moreover, we can rephrase one of the main results of [43] with the following forms: For any simple module $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$ and Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A_n, there exist two n-tuple of sequences

$$\{(a_{1;\mathbf{i}_k}, a_{2;\mathbf{i}_k},\dots,a_{\mathbf{i}_k-1;\mathbf{i}_k}, a_{\mathbf{i}_k;\mathbf{i}_k}) \mid 1\le k\le n\} \text{ and}$$
$$\{(a_{\mathbf{j}_l;\mathbf{j}_l}, a_{\mathbf{j}_l;\mathbf{j}_l+1},\dots,a_{\mathbf{j}_l;n-1}, a_{\mathbf{j}_l;n}) \mid 1\le l\le n\}$$

such that $a_{s;\mathbf{i}_k}, a_{\mathbf{j}_l;u} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $1 \le s \le \mathbf{i}_k$, $\mathbf{j}_l \le u \le n$, $1 \le k,l \le n$ and

$$\mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{n}\left(\mathop{\circ}_{s=1}^{\mathbf{i}_k} S_Q\big([s,\mathbf{i}_k]\big)^{\circ a_{s;\mathbf{i}_k}}\right) \twoheadrightarrow M \quad \text{and} \quad \mathop{\circ}_{l=1}^{n}\left(\mathop{\circ}_{u=\mathbf{j}_l}^{n} S_Q\big([\mathbf{j}_l,u]\big)^{\circ a_{\mathbf{j}_l;u}}\right) \twoheadrightarrow M,$$

where $[s,\mathbf{i}_k],[\mathbf{j}_l,u] \in \Phi_n^+$, $(\mathbf{i}_1,\mathbf{i}_2,\cdots,\mathbf{i}_{n-1},\mathbf{i}_n)$ and $(\mathbf{j}_1,\mathbf{j}_2,\cdots,\mathbf{j}_{n-1},\mathbf{j}_n)$ are re-indexing of $\{1,2,\cdots,n\}$ defined by the combinatorial property we observed in this paper (Theorem 4.14). Here, $\mathop{\circ}_{s=1}^{\mathbf{i}_k} S_Q\big([s,\mathbf{i}_k]\big)^{\circ a_{s;\mathbf{i}_k}}$ and $\mathop{\circ}_{u=\mathbf{j}_l}^{n} S_Q\big([\mathbf{j}_l,u]\big)^{\circ a_{\mathbf{j}_l;u}}$ are simple, and hence every simple R_{A_n}-module appears as a head of convolution product of n-simple modules.

Lastly, for $A_m^{(2)}$, we will prove that the description for $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ in Definition 5.1 can be re-expressed (Theorem 5.2) by using the combinatorial properties and the Dorey's type morphisms studied in [44]. The observations on $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ will be one of the main ingredients for investigating relations between $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$ and $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ in [30].

We call a positive root $\beta = \sum_k n_k\alpha_k$ *multiplicity free* if $n_k \le 1$ for all $1 \le k \le n$. Note that all positive roots in Φ_n^+ of finite type A are multiplicity free. However, it is not true for Φ_n^+ of finite type D and E. Thus we can ask the following question naturally:

Conjecture For any Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A, D or E, every pair (α,β) of a positive root $\gamma = \alpha+\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ is a minimal with respect to a suitable total order compatible with $\prec_Q$ if and only if γ is multiplicity free.

In the forthcoming paper [45], we will prove that the above conjecture is true for Φ_n^+ of finite type D. In other word, there exists a pair (α,β) of a multiplicity non-free positive root $\gamma = \alpha+\beta$ such that the pair can not be minimal for *any* total order compatible with

$\prec_Q$. Furthermore, we will prove that the Dorey's rule always holds even though (α, β) is not minimal; i.e., $S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma)$ for every Dynkin quiver Q of finite type D, every positive root γ and its pair (α, β).

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 1, we first recall the definition of AR-quivers Γ_Q and their basic properties, briefly review the various orders on Φ_n^+, and provide explicit descriptions for Γ_Q of finite type A. In Section 2, we recall the backgrounds and theories of the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality briefly. In the later sections, we investigate the categories $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$ using the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality and the explicit descriptions of Γ_Q in Section 1.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express his gratitude to Professor Seok-Jin Kang, Professor Masaki Kashiwara, Professor Kyungyong Lee and Myungho Kim for many fruitful discussions. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions, also. The author gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of RIMS (Kyoto) during his visit in 2013 and 2014.

1. Combinatorial characterization of AR-quivers of finite type A

In this section, we recall Gabriel's Theorem and various orders on the set of positive roots. We also observe the combinatorial feature of AR-quivers Γ_Q of finite type A and provides an explicit combinatorial description of Γ_Q. We refer to [3, 4, 18] for basic theories on quiver representations and Auslander-Reiten theory.

1.1. **Gabriel's Theorem.** Let Δ_n be a rank n *Dynkin diagram* of finite type. We denote by $I_0 = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ the set of indices, $\Pi_n = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I_0\}$ the set of *simple roots*, Φ_n (Φ_n^+, Φ_n^-) the set of (positive, negative) roots, E the vector space which Φ_n lies, and $(\ ,\ )$ scalar product defined on E which are associated to the Dynkin diagram Δ_n.

Let W_0 be the Weyl group associated to Δ_n, which is generated by the set of simple reflections $(s_i)_{i \in I_0}$. We denote by w_0 the unique longest element in W_0. It is well-known that w_0 induces an involution * on I_0 given by $w_0\alpha_i = -\alpha_{i^*}$ (see [8, PLATE I$\sim$IX]).

The Dynkin quiver Q is obtained by assigning orientation on the edges of Δ_n; i.e., Q is a data (Q_0, Q_1) where Q_0 is a set of vertices indexed by I_0 and Q_1 is a set of arrows with underlying graph Δ_n. We say that a vertex i is a *source* (resp. *sink*) if and only if there are only exiting arrows out of it (resp. entering arrows into it).

Let $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ be the category of finite dimensional modules over the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$. An object $\mathtt{M}$ in this category is defined by the following data:

(a) To each $i \in Q_0$ is associated a finite dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $\mathtt{M}_i$.
(b) To each arrow $i \xrightarrow{\mathsf{a}} j$ in Q_1 is associated to a linear map $\varphi_{i \xrightarrow{\mathsf{a}} j} : \mathtt{M}_i \to \mathtt{M}_j$.

We define *the dimension vector* of $\mathtt{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ as

$$\underline{\dim}\ \mathtt{M} := \sum_{i \in Q_0} (\dim\ \mathtt{M}_i)\alpha_i.$$

The simple objects in $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$ are one dimensional vector spaces $\mathtt{S}(i)$ $(i \in Q_0)$ which can be characterized by $\underline{\dim}\ \mathtt{S}(i) = \alpha_i$. We denote by $\mathrm{Ind}Q$ the set of isomorphism classes $[\mathtt{M}]$ of indecomposable modules in $\mathrm{Mod}\mathbb{C}Q$.

Theorem 1.1. (*Gabriel's Theorem*) For a Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A, D or E, the map $[\mathtt{M}] \mapsto \underline{\dim}\ \mathtt{M}$ gives a bijection from $\mathrm{Ind}Q$ to Φ_n^+.

Thus the set $\mathrm{Ind}Q$ consists of the indecomposable modules $\mathtt{M}(\beta)$ $(\beta \in \Phi_n^+)$ such that $\underline{\dim}\big(\mathtt{M}(\beta)\big) = \beta$ when a Dynkin quiver Q is of finite type A, D or E.

1.2. **Auslander-Reiten quiver.** In this subsection, we fix a Dynkin quiver Q whose underlying graph is of finite type A, D or E. We denote by s_iQ the quiver obtained from Q by reversing the orientation of each arrow that ends at i or starts at i. A map $\xi : I_0 \to \mathbb{Z}$ is called a *height function on* Q if $\xi_j = \xi_i - 1$ for $i \to j \in Q_1$. Connectedness of Q implies that any two height functions on Q differ by a constant.

Set

$$\mathbb{Z}Q := \{(i,p) \in \{1,2,\dots,n\} \times \mathbb{Z} \mid p - \xi_i \in 2\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We view $\mathbb{Z}Q$ as the quiver with arrows

$$(i,p) \to (j,p+1),\ (j,q) \to (i,q+1) \ \text{ for which } i \text{ and } j \text{ are adjacent in } \Delta_n$$

and call it the *repetition quiver* of Q. Note that $\mathbb{Z}Q$ does not depend on the orientation of the quiver Q. It is well-known that the quiver $\mathbb{Z}Q$ itself has an isomorphism with the AR-quiver of $D^b(\mathbb{C}Q)$-mod, the bounded derived category of $\mathbb{C}Q$-mod ([20]). In our convention, the injective module $\mathtt{I}(i)$ is located on the vertex (i,ξ_i) of $\mathbb{Z}Q$.

For a reduced expression $\widetilde{w} = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_l}$ of an element w in W_0, it is called *adapted to* Q if

$$i_k \text{ is a source of } s_{i_{k-1}}\cdots s_{i_2}s_{i_1}Q \text{ for all } 1 \le k \le l.$$

It is well-known that there is a *unique Coxeter element* τ whose reduced representations are adapted to Q.

Set $\widehat{\Phi}_n := \Phi_n^+ \times \mathbb{Z}$. For $i \in I_0$, we define

$$\gamma_i = \sum_{j \in B(i)} \alpha_j \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_i = \sum_{j \in C(i)} \alpha_j \qquad \text{where} \tag{1.1}$$

- $B(i)$ is the set of vertices j in Q_0 such that there exists a path from j to i,
- $C(i)$ is the set of vertices j in Q_0 such that there exists a path from i to j.

The bijection $\phi : \mathbb{Z}Q \to \widehat{\Phi}_n$ defined by $\mathtt{M}(\beta)[m] \mapsto (\beta, m)$ is described combinatorially as follows ([22, §2.2]):

(1.2)
(a) $\phi(i, \xi_i) = (\gamma_i, 0)$,
(b) for a given $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\phi(i,p) = (\beta, m)$,
- if $\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+$, we set $\phi(i, p-2) = (\tau(\beta), m)$,
- if $\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^-$, we set $\phi(i, p-2) = (-\tau(\beta), m-1)$,
- if $\tau^{-1}(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+$, we set $\phi(i, p+2) = (\tau^{-1}(\beta), m)$,
- if $\tau^{-1}(\beta) \in \Phi_n^-$, we set $\phi(i, p+2) = (-\tau^{-1}(\beta), m+1)$.

The *Auslander-Reiten quiver* Γ_Q is the full subquiver of $\mathbb{Z}Q$ whose set of vertices is $\phi^{-1}(\Phi_n^+ \times \{0\})$. Here the vertex $\phi^{-1}(\beta, 0)$ corresponds to the indecomposable module $\mathtt{M}(\beta)$ in Ind$Q$ and the arrow $\phi^{-1}(\beta,0) \to \phi^{-1}(\beta', 0)$ corresponds to an *irreducible* morphism from $\mathtt{M}(\beta)$ to $\mathtt{M}(\beta')$.

In particular, the injective envelope $\mathtt{I}(i)$ of $\mathtt{S}(i)$ corresponds to the vertex $\phi^{-1}(\gamma_i, 0)$ and the projective cover $\mathtt{P}(i)$ of $\mathtt{S}(i)$ corresponds to the vertex $\phi^{-1}(\theta_{i^*}, 0)$. It is well-known that

$$\theta_i = \tau^{m_{i^*}}(\gamma_{i^*}) \quad \text{where } m_i = \max\{k \geq 0 \mid \tau^k(\gamma_i) \in \Phi_n^+\}. \tag{1.3}$$

For $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+$, we set $\tau\mathtt{M}(\beta) := \mathtt{M}(\tau(\beta))$. In the Auslander-Reiten quiver Γ_Q, this map τ is called *the Auslander-Reiten translation*.

(i) The dimension vector is an *additive function* on Γ_Q with respect to the map τ; that is, for each vertices $\mathtt{X} \in \Gamma_Q$ such that $\mathtt{X} = \phi^{-1}(\beta, 0)$ and $\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^+$,

$$\underline{\dim}\ \mathtt{X} + \underline{\dim}\ \tau\mathtt{X} = \sum_{\mathtt{Z} \in \mathtt{X}^-} \underline{\dim}\ \mathtt{Z}. \tag{1.4}$$

Here $\mathtt{X}^-$ is the set of vertices $\mathtt{Z}$ in Γ_Q such that there exists an arrow from $\mathtt{Z}$ to $\mathtt{X}$.

(ii) It is well-known that, for $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$,

$$\tau(\beta) \in \Phi_n^- \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \beta = \theta_i \quad \text{for some } i \in I_0. \tag{1.5}$$

A subquiver Γ' of Γ_Q is said to be *sectional* ([9]) if whenever $x \to y$ and $y \to z$ are arrows in Γ', we have $x \neq \tau(z)$.

The following description is one of the characterization of Γ_Q inside $\mathbb{Z}Q$:

$$\phi^{-1}(\Phi_n^+ \times \{0\}) = \{(i,p) \in \mathbb{Z}Q \mid \xi_i - 2m_i \leq p \leq \xi_i\}. \tag{1.6}$$

Recall that there is the *Nakayama permutation* ν on $\mathbb{Z}Q$ which is given by

$$\nu(i,p) = (i^*, p + \mathtt{h}_n - 2)$$

where $\mathtt{h}_n$ is the Coxeter number associated to Δ_n. Since, for all $i \in I_0$, the Nakayama permutation ν sends vertices corresponding to $\mathtt{P}(i)$ to vertices corresponding to $\mathtt{I}(i^*)$, we

have

$$\xi_{i^*} - 2m_{i^*} = \xi_i - \mathtt{h}_n + 2. \tag{1.7}$$

1.3. **Orders on Φ_n^+.** In this section, we recall various orders on Φ_n^+.

A *convex order* on Φ_n^+ is a partial order $\preceq$ satisfying the following condition ([7]):

$$\text{For all } \alpha, \beta \text{ and } \gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+, \text{ either } \alpha \prec \gamma \prec \beta \text{ or } \beta \prec \gamma \prec \alpha.$$

Note that a *coarsest* convex partial order on Φ_n^+ determines the *commutation class* of w_0; that is, the equivalence class on reduced expressions of w_0 which is given by

$$s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{\mathsf{N}}} \sim s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \cdots s_{j_{\mathsf{N}}} \qquad (\mathsf{N} := |\Phi_n^+|)$$

if and only if $s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \cdots s_{j_{\mathsf{N}}}$ is obtained from $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{\mathsf{N}}}$ by replacing $s_a s_b$ by $s_b s_a$ for a and b not linked in Δ_n (see [5]).

A Dynkin quiver Q defines a convex partial order $\preceq_Q$ on Φ_n^+ in the following way [47]:

$$\alpha \preceq_Q \beta \text{ if and only if there is a path from } \beta \text{ to } \alpha \text{ in } \Gamma_Q. \tag{1.8}$$

Thus, for a pair (α, β) with $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ and $\alpha \prec_Q \beta$,

$$\text{there exist paths from } \beta \text{ to } \gamma \text{ and from } \gamma \text{ to } \alpha \text{ in } \Gamma_Q. \tag{1.9}$$

On the other hand, it is well-known that a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0 = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_N}$ of w_0 induces a *convex total order* $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ on Φ_n^+ by ([8])

$$\beta_z := s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{z-1}} \alpha_{i_z} \text{ and } \beta_x <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta_y \text{ if and only if } x < y. \tag{1.10}$$

Note that any convex total order is obtained in this way by a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0 ([46]).

The following theorem provides a way of obtaining all reduced expressions of w_0 adapted to Q and hence convex total orders compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$:

$$\alpha \prec_Q \beta \text{ implies } \alpha <_{\widetilde{w}_0} \beta \text{ for any } \widetilde{w}_0 \text{ adapted to } Q. \tag{1.11}$$

Theorem 1.2. [5, Theorem 2.17] *Let Q be a quiver of finite type A, D or E. Then any reduced expression of w_0 adapted to Q can be obtained in the following way: We read Γ_Q sequentially, in a manner compatible with arrows; that is, if there exists an arrow $\beta \to \alpha$, α appears before β. Replacing a vertex β with i for $\phi^{-1}(\beta) = (i, p)$, we have a sequence $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{\mathsf{N}})$ giving a reduced expression of w_0 adapted to Q,*

$$\widetilde{w}_0 = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{\mathsf{N}}}.$$

Remark 1.3. In this remark, we suggest two canonical readings of Γ_Q which follow the rule in Theorem 1.2. Thus we can obtain two convex total orders on Φ_n^+ compatible with $\preceq_Q$.

(A) We denote by $<_Q^L$ the convex total order induced from the following reading:

$$(i,p) \text{ appears before } (i',p') \iff \begin{cases} d(1,i)-p < d(1,i')-p' & \text{or} \\ d(1,i)-p = d(1,i')-p' & \text{and} \quad i > i'. \end{cases}$$

(B) We denote by $<_Q^U$ the convex total order induced from the following reading:

$$(i,p) \text{ appears before } (i',p') \iff \begin{cases} d(1,i)+p > d(1,i')+p' & \text{or} \\ d(1,i)+p = d(1,i')+p' & \text{and} \quad i < i'. \end{cases}$$

Here, $d(i,j)$ denotes the distance between i and j in Δ_n.

Definition 1.4. [43, §2.1]. For a total order $<$ on Φ_n^+, a pair (α,β) with $\alpha<\beta$ is called a *minimal pair of* $\gamma\in\Phi_n^+$ *with respect to the total order* $<$ if

- $\gamma=\alpha+\beta$,
- there exist *no* pair (α',β') such that $\gamma=\alpha'+\beta'$ and $\alpha<\alpha'<\gamma<\beta'<\beta$.

1.4. **Characterization of Auslander-Reiten quiver of type A.** In this subsection, we fix the Δ_n as the Dynkin diagram of finite type A. Citing the referee, the combinatorial properties in this subsection is well-known to the experts. More precisely, using the *linear quiver* $\overleftarrow{Q}$ (see (4.2)), the *reflection functor* on $D^b(\mathbb{C}Q)$-mod and the tilting theorem ([4, Chapter VII]), one can observe the descriptions in this subsection. However, we have a difficulty for finding the explicit statement of Theorem 1.11 in standard textbooks, we shall deal with and derive it from Lemma 1.7 and Remark 1.8 below.

Since Δ_n is the Dynkin diagram of finite type A, we have the Coxeter number $\mathtt{h}_n=n+1$ and the involution induced by $w_0\in W_0$ is given by $i\mapsto i^*=n+1-i$. We say that a vertex $i\in Q$ is a right (resp. left) intermediate if

in Q.

Recall that, for every $1\le a\le b\le n$, $\beta=\sum_{a\le k\le b}\alpha_k$ is a positive root in Φ_n^+ and every positive root in Φ_n^+ is of the form. Thus we sometimes identify $\beta\in\Phi_n^+$ (and hence vertex in Γ_Q) with a segment $[a,b]$. For $\beta=[a,b]$, we say a the *first component* of β and b the *second component* of β. If β is simple, we write β as $[a]$.

Example 1.5. Consider the quiver 

of type A_5. We set $\xi_1=0$. Then the Γ_Q inside $\mathbb{Z}Q$ can be obtained by using the Coxeter element τ (1.2) or the additive

property of the dimension vectors (1.4) as follows:



Definition 1.6. (a) A path ρ in Γ_Q is *S-sectional* (resp. *N-sectional*) if the path is a concatenation of arrows whose forms are $(i,p) \to (i+1, p+1)$ (resp. $(i,p) \to (i-1, p+1)$).

(b) A positive root $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ is *contained in the path* ρ in Γ_Q if β is an end or a start of some arrow in the path ρ.

(c) An S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path ρ is *maximal* if there is no longer S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path containing all positive roots in ρ.

(d) For $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (i,p)$, we denote by $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = i$ and $\phi_2^{-1}(\beta) = p$.

The main goal of this subsection is to provide an explicit description of an AR-quiver of finite type A by using the following lemma and basic properties for an AR-quiver in §1.2.

Lemma 1.7. [5, Lemma 2.11],[28, §3.2]

(a) *For* $k \in I_0$,

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0) = \begin{cases} (k, \xi_k) & \text{if } k \text{ is a source,} \\ (n+1-k, \xi_k - n + 1) & \text{if } k \text{ is a sink,} \\ (1, \xi_k - k + 1) & \text{if } k \text{ is a left intermediate,} \\ (n, \xi_k - n + k) & \text{if } k \text{ is a right intermediate.} \end{cases}$$

(b) *If* $\beta \to \alpha$ *is an arrow in* Γ_Q *for* $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi_n^+$, *then* $(\beta, \alpha) = 1$.

(c) *We have*

$$(i, \xi_j - d(i,j)),\ (i, \xi_j - 2m_j + d(i,j)) \in \Gamma_Q \quad \text{for any } i, j \in I_0. \tag{1.12}$$

Proof. The second and third assertions are identical with [5, Lemma 2.11] and [28, Lemma 3.2.2], respectively. For the first assertion, we can use the [28, Lemma 3.2.3] in the following way: (i) If k is a left intermediate, then take the extremal vertex i as 1 in I_0. Then the formula

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0) = (i, \xi_k - d(i,k)) \tag{1.13}$$

in [28, page 17] tells that $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0) = (1, \xi_k - k + 1)$. (ii) If k is a right intermediate, then take the extremal vertex i as n in I_0. Then (1.13) tells that $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0) = (n, \xi_k - n + k)$. It is obvious for k which is a source or a sink. □

Remark 1.8. For a left (resp. right) intermediate k, we can take also the extremal vertex i as n (resp. 1) in I_0. Then we have

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0) = (i^*, \xi_{k^*} - 2m_{k^*} + d(i, k)) \tag{1.14}$$

by the formula [28, page 18].

Proposition 1.9. *Let ρ be an N-sectional (resp. S-sectional) path containing simple root. Then every positive roots contained in ρ has the same first (resp. second) component.*

Proof. (1) Let t be a source in Q; i.e., $\overset{}{\bullet}_{t-1} \leftarrow \bullet_{t} \rightarrow \bullet_{t+1}$. Since t is a source,

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t-1) = [a, t],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t+1) = [t, b] \text{ for some } a \le t-1 \text{ and } b \ge t+1.$$

Note that $t-1$ or $t+1 \in I_0$. By Lemma 1.7 (c), the following subquiver is contained in Γ_Q:



By the additive property of the dimension vectors (1.4), we have

- $[t+1, b] = M_1 - [t] = B_1 - N_1 = B_2 - N_2 = B_{t-1} - N_{t-1} = \beta$ and
- $[a, t-1] = N_1 - [t] = C_1 - M_1 = C_2 - M_2 = C_{n-t} - M_{n-t} = \eta$.

Since $\beta + N_2 = B_2 \in \Phi_n^+$, N_2 is $[b+1, d]$ or $[a_2, t]$. If $N_2 = [b+1, d]$, then $(N_1, N_2) = 0$, which yields a contradiction to Lemma 1.7 (b). Thus $N_2 = [c, t]$. In this way, one can show that N_u for $1 \le u \le t-1$ is of the form $[a_u, t]$. By the similar way, we can prove that M_v for $1 \le v \le n-t$ is of the form $[t, b_v]$.

(2) Let t be a sink in Q; i.e., $\overset{}{\bullet}_{t-1} \rightarrow \bullet_{t} \leftarrow \bullet_{t+1}$. Since t is a sink,

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t-1) = [a, t],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t+1) = [t, b] \text{ for some } a \le t-1 \text{ and } b \ge t+1.$$

By using a similar argument given in (1), one can prove our assertion.

(3) Let t be a left intermediate in Q; i.e., $\overset{}{\bullet}_{t-1} \rightarrow \bullet_{t} \rightarrow \bullet_{t+1}$. Then we have

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t-1) = [k, t-1],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t) = [k, t],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t^*) = [t, l] \text{ and } \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t^*-1) = [t+1, l]$$

for some $k \leq t-1$ and $t+1 \leq l$. Moreover, Lemma 1.7 (a) tells that $\phi^{-1}(\alpha_t, 0) = (1, \xi_t - t + 1)$. By Lemma 1.7 (c), the following subquivers are contained in Γ_Q:



Since $[t] + N_k = M_k \in \Phi_n^+$, N_k is $[a_k, t-1]$ or $[t+1, b_k]$. However $(N_{t-1}, N_t) = 1$ implies that $N_{t-1} = [a_{t-1}, t-1]$ and hence $M_{t-1} = [a_{t-1}, t]$. Then we can show $M_k = [a_k, t]$ for $1 \leq k \leq t$ by using the additive property of the dimension vectors (1.4).

By applying the same argument, one can prove $J_k = [t, b_k]$ for $1 \leq k \leq t^*$.

(4) Let t be a right intermediate in Q; i.e.,  . Then we have

$$\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t) = [t, l],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(t+1) = [t+1, l],\ \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t^*) = [k, t] \text{ and } \underline{\dim}\mathtt{P}(t^*+1) = [k, t-1]$$

for some $k \leq t-1$ and $t+1 \leq l$. By using a similar argument given in (3), one can prove our assertion. □

Proposition 1.10. *Let ρ be a maximal N-sectional path or a maximal S-sectional path. Then it contains a simple root.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.9, ρ contains at most one simple root. Assume that ρ is a maximal N-sectional path which does not contain a simple root, and we write $\rho = N_t \to N_{t-1} \to \cdots \to N_1$.

Assume first that $\phi_1^{-1}(N_1) = a \neq 1$. Hence, $N_1 = \tau^k(\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(a))$, for some $k \geq 0$. If the arrow between a and $a-1$ in Δ_n was  , the irreducible morphism $\mathtt{I}(a) \to \mathtt{I}(a-1)$ would give the arrow $(a, \xi_a) \to (a-1, \xi_a + 1)$. Applying τ^k, we would have a contradiction to the maximality of ρ. Thus, a is either right intermediate or a source:

$$\text{or} \quad \text{in } Q.$$

In both cases, N_1 is the vertex for an injective module: otherwise, we have an arrow $N_1 \to \tau^{k-1}(\underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(a-1))$ in Γ_Q and it contradicts the maximality of ρ again. Thus we have $\phi^{-1}(N_1, 0) = (a, \xi_a)$. Hence Lemma 1.7 (c) tells that $\phi^{-1}(N_t, 0) = (n, \xi_a - n + a)$. Thus Lemma 1.7(a) implies that $N_t = [a]$ if a is right intermediate and $N_1 = [a]$ if a is a source, contradicting our assumption that ρ does not contain a simple root. Hence we have $\phi_1^{-1}(N_1) = 1$.

If $\phi_2^{-1}(N_1) = \xi_1$ then $N_1 = \underline{\dim}\mathtt{I}(1)$. Since 1 is a source or sink, then $N_1 = [1]$, or $N_{t=n} = [1]$ and $\phi^{-1}(N_n) = (n, \xi_n - 2m_n)$ contradicting our assumption on ρ again.

Now we assume that $\phi_2^{-1}(N_1) < \xi_1$. If $\phi_1^{-1}(N_t) = b \neq n$, then



in Q,

by the similar reason as above. In both cases, $\phi^{-1}(N_t, 0) = (b, \xi_b - 2m_b)$. Hence Lemma 1.7 (c) tells that $\phi_1^{-1}(N_1) = (1, \xi_b - 2m_b + (b-1))$. Thus Lemma 1.7 (a) and Remark 1.8 imply that $N_1 = [b^*]$ if b is a left intermediate, and $N_t = [b^*]$ if b is a sink, respectively. Thus we have $t = n$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(N_n) = n$. However, the below inequality

$$\phi_2^{-1}(N_n) = \phi_2^{-1}(N_1) - n + 1 < \xi_n - 2m_n = \xi_1 - n + 1$$

yields a contradiction to (1.6). Similarly, one can prove our assertion for a maximal S-sectional path. □

Theorem 1.11. *Every positive root in an N-sectional path has the same first component and every root in an S-sectional path has the same second component.*

Proof. By the previous proposition, every maximal N-sectional path (resp. maximal S-sectional path) contains a simple root. Thus our assertion follows from Proposition 1.9 and the fact that every N-sectional path (resp. S-sectional path) is contained in some maximal N-sectional path (resp. maximal S-sectional path). □

Thus we say that an N-sectional path ρ is the *maximal (N, i)-sectional path* if all positive roots contained in ρ have i as a first component. Similarly, we can define a notion of the *maximal (S, i)-sectional path.*

Corollary 1.12. *For $1 \leq i \leq n$, the Auslander-Reiten quiver Γ_Q of finite type A contains a maximal N-sectional path of length $n - i$ once and exactly once. At the same time, Γ_Q contains a maximal S-sectional path of length $i - 1$ once and exactly once.*

Proof. For $i \in I$, there are $(n - i + 1)$-many positive roots whose first component is i, and i-many positive roots whose second component is i. Thus our assertion follows from Theorem 1.11. □

Corollary 1.13. *For vertices β, $\beta' \in \Phi_n^+$ with $\beta \prec_Q \beta'$ and $\beta + \beta' \in \Phi_n^+$,*

(1.15) *there exists only one path from β' to $\beta + \beta'$. So is from $\beta + \beta'$ to β.*

Proof. The proof comes from (1.8) and Theorem 1.11. □

To get a Γ_Q from Q, we have used $\tau(\beta)$ (1.2) or the additive property of the dimension vectors (1.4). On the other hand, Lemma 1.7 and Theorem 1.11 provide a combinatorial way for computing the bijection ϕ^{-1} without using the Coxeter element and the additive property of the dimension vectors.

The following remark is well-known to experts but we record here for later use.

Remark 1.14. (a) By Lemma 1.7 (a), we know the images of Π_n in Γ_Q.
(b) For each $a \in I_0$, we draw a hook as follows:

(i) If a is a source,

$$\overbrace{N_n \to \cdots N_{a-1} \to N_a}^{\text{maximal } (N,a)\text{-sectional path}} = [a] = \underbrace{S_a \leftarrow S_{a-1} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow S_1}_{\text{maximal } (S,a)\text{-sectional path}}.$$

(ii) If a is a sink,

$$\overbrace{N_n \leftarrow \cdots N_{n-a} \leftarrow N_{n-a+1}}^{\text{maximal } (N,a)\text{-sectional path}} = [a] = \underbrace{S_{n-a+1} \to S_{n-a+2} \to \cdots \to S_1}_{\text{maximal } (S,a)\text{-sectional path}}.$$

(iii) If $\overset{}{\underset{a-1}{\bullet}} \longrightarrow \overset{}{\underset{a}{\bullet}} \longrightarrow \overset{}{\underset{a+1}{\bullet}}$ in Q,

$$\overbrace{N_{n-a+1} \to \cdots N_2 \to N_1}^{\text{maximal } (N,a)\text{-sectional path}} = [a] = \underbrace{S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_a}_{\text{maximal } (S,a)\text{-sectional path}}.$$

(iv) If $\overset{}{\underset{a-1}{\bullet}} \longleftarrow \overset{}{\underset{a}{\bullet}} \longleftarrow \overset{}{\underset{a+1}{\bullet}}$ in Q,

$$\overbrace{N_a \leftarrow \cdots N_{n-1} \leftarrow N_n}^{\text{maximal } (N,a)\text{-sectional path}} = [a] = \underbrace{S_n \leftarrow S_{n-1} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow S_{n+1-a}}_{\text{maximal } (S,a)\text{-sectional path}}.$$

Here $\phi_1^{-1}(N_k) = k$ and $\phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = l$.
(c) If (i,p) in Γ_Q is located at an intersection of an (N,a)-sectional path and an (S,b)-sectional path,

$$\phi^{-1}([a,b],0) = (i,p).$$

Let κ and σ be subsets of Φ_n^+ defined as follows:

$$\kappa := \{\beta \in \Phi_n^+ \mid \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = 1\}, \quad \sigma := \{\beta \in \Phi^+ \mid \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = n\}. \tag{1.16}$$

We enumerate the positive roots in $\kappa = \{\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_r\}$ and $\sigma = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s\}$ in the following way:

$$\phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_{i+1}) + 2 = \phi_2^{-1}(\kappa_i),\ \phi_2^{-1}(\sigma_{j+1}) - 2 = \phi_2^{-1}(\sigma_j) \text{ for } 1 \le i < r \text{ and } 1 \le j < s.$$

Corollary 1.15. (a) *If* $\kappa_i = [a,b]$, *then* $\kappa_{i+1} = [b+1,c]$.
(b) *If* $\sigma_j = [a,b]$, *then* $\sigma_{j+1} = [b+1,c]$.
(c) $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \kappa_i = [1,n] = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \sigma_j$

(d) *If* $\phi_1^{-1}([1,n]) = k$, *then* $r = k = m_1$, $s = n+1-k = m_n$ *and hence*

$$\phi^{-1}([1,n]) = (m_1, \xi_1 - m_1 + 1) = (n+1-m_n, \xi_n - m_n + 1).$$

Proof. By Remark 1.14, we have a subquiver in Γ_Q which can be described as follows:



Then our assertions easily follow from observations on the given subquiver. □

2. The generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality

In this section, we briefly recall the backgrounds and theories on the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality developed in [27, 28]. Thus, for precise statements and definitions referred in this section, see [1, 22, 27, 28, 35, 44].

2.1. **Quantum affine algebras and the category $\mathscr{C}_Q$.** Let $I = \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ be a set of indices. An *affine Cartan datum* is a quadruple $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$ consisting of

(a) a matrix A of corank 1, called the *affine Cartan matrix* satisfying

$$\text{(i) } a_{ii} = 2 \ (i \in I), \quad \text{(ii) } a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}, \quad \text{(iii) } a_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } a_{ji} = 0$$

with $\mathsf{D} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathsf{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid i \in I)$ making DA symmetric,

(b) a free abelian group P of rank $n+2$, the *weight lattice*,

(c) an linearly independent set $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathsf{P}$, the set of *simple roots*,

(d) an linearly independent set $\Pi^\vee = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathsf{P}^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{P}, \mathbb{Z})$, the set of *simple coroots*,

which satisfy

(1) $\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle = a_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in I$,

(2) for each $i \in I$, there exists $\Lambda_i \in \mathsf{P}$ such that $\langle h_i, \Lambda_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for all $j \in I$.

We call $\mathsf{Q} = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ the *root lattice*, and $\mathsf{Q}^+ = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i$ the *positive cone* of the root lattice. For $\beta = \sum_{i \in I} k_i \alpha_i \in \mathsf{Q}^+$, the *height* of β is defined by $|\beta| = \sum_{i \in I} k_i$. We denote by $\delta = \sum_{i \in I} \mathsf{a}_i h_i$ the *null root* and by $c = \sum_{i \in I} \mathsf{c}_i h_i$ the *center* ([25, Chapter 4]).

Set $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathsf{P}^\vee$. Then there exists a symmetric bilinear form $(\ ,\ )$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying

$$\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle = \frac{2(\alpha_i, \lambda)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)} \quad \text{for any } i \in I \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*.$$

We normalize the bilinear form by $\langle c, \lambda \rangle = (\delta, \lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

We choose $0 \in I$ as the leftmost vertices in the tables in [25, pages 54, 55] except $A_{2n}^{(2)}$-case in which we take the longest simple root as α_0.

We denote $\mathfrak{g}$ by the affine Kac-Moody algebra associated with the Cartan datum $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0$ by the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by e_i, f_i and K_i for $i \in I_0$. Note that $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra.

Let γ be the smallest positive integer such that

$$\gamma(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2 \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for any } i \in I.$$

Note that $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2$ takes the rational number $1, 2, 1/2, 1/3$ when $\mathfrak{g} = G_2^{(1)}$.

For an indeterminate q, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $i \in I$, we define $q_i = q^{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2}$ and

$$[n]_i = \frac{q_i^n - q_i^{-n}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \quad [n]_i! = \prod_{k=1}^{n} [k]_i, \quad \begin{bmatrix} m \\ n \end{bmatrix}_i = \frac{[m]_i!}{[m-n]_i![n]_i!}.$$

Let $\mathbf{k}$ be an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{C}(q)$ in $\cup_{m>0}\mathbb{C}((q^{1/m}))$.

Definition 2.1. The *quantum affine algebra* $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$ is the associative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra generated by e_i, f_i $(i \in I)$ and q^h $(h \in \gamma^{-1}\mathsf{P}^\vee)$ satisfying following relations:

(1) $q^0 = 1, q^h q^{h'} = q^{h+h'}$ for $h, h' \in \gamma^{-1}\mathsf{P}^\vee$,
(2) $q^h e_i q^{-h} = q^{\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} e_i$, $q^h f_i q^{-h} = q^{-\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} f_i$ for $h \in \gamma^{-1}\mathsf{P}^\vee, i \in I$,
(3) $e_i f_j - f_j e_i = \delta_{ij} \dfrac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$, where $K_i = q_i^{h_i}$,
(4) $\displaystyle\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k e_i^{(1-a_{ij}-k)} e_j e_i^{(k)} = \sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k f_i^{(1-a_{ij}-k)} f_j f_i^{(k)} = 0 \quad$ for $i \neq j$,

where $e_i^{(k)} = e_i^k/[k]_i!$ and $f_i^{(k)} = f_i^k/[k]_i!$.

We denote by $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by $e_i, f_i, K_i^{\pm 1}$ $(i \in I)$ and call it also the *quantum affine algebra*.

We call $\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} := \mathsf{P}/\mathbb{Z}\delta$ the *classical weight lattice*. For $\mathrm{cl} : \mathsf{P} \to \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ the canonical projection, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{cl}(\Lambda_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}, \mathbb{Z}) = \{h \in \mathsf{P}^\vee \mid \langle h, \delta \rangle = 0\} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}h_i.$$

Set $\Pi_{\mathrm{cl}} = \mathrm{cl}(\Pi)$ and $\Pi_{\mathrm{cl}}^\vee = \{h_0 \cdots, h_n\}$. Then we can regard $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ as the quantum affine algebra associated with the *classical affine Cartan datum* $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}, \Pi_{\mathrm{cl}}, \Pi_{\mathrm{cl}}^\vee)$.

Set

$$\varpi_i = \gcd(\mathsf{c}_0, \mathsf{c}_i)^{-1}(\mathsf{c}_0\Lambda_i - \mathsf{c}_i\Lambda_0) \in \mathsf{P} \quad \text{for } i \in I_0.$$

Then $\{\mathrm{cl}(\varpi_i) \mid i \in I_0\}$ forms a basis of $\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}^0 := \{\lambda \in \mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} \mid \langle c, \lambda\rangle = 0\}$. The Weyl group W_0 of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ acts on $\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}^0$ ([1, §1.2]).

For $i \in I_0$, there exists a unique simple $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V(\varpi_i)$ (up to an isomorphism), called the *ith fundamental module*, satisfying the certain properties ([1, §1.3]). Moreover, there exist the left dual $V(\varpi_i)^*$ and the right dual ${}^*V(\varpi_i)$ of $V(\varpi_i)$ with the following $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-homomorphisms

$$V(\varpi_i)^* \otimes V(\varpi_i) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}} \mathbf{k} \quad \text{and} \quad V(\varpi_i) \otimes {}^*V(\varpi_i) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}} \mathbf{k} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$V(\varpi_i)^* := V(\varpi_{i^*})_{(p^*)^{-1}},\ {}^*V(\varpi_i) := V(\varpi_{i^*})_{p^*} \quad \text{and} \quad p^* := (-1)^{\langle \rho^\vee, \delta\rangle} q^{(\rho,\delta)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Here ρ is defined by $\langle h_i, \rho\rangle = 1$ and $\rho^\vee$ is defined by $\langle \rho^\vee, \alpha_i\rangle = 1$ for all $i \in I$ (see [1, §1.3]).

We say that a $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module M is *good* if it has a *bar involution*, a crystal basis with *simple crystal graph*, and a *global basis* (see [35] for precise definitions). For instance, every fundamental module is a good module. Note that every good module is a simple $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module.

Definition 2.2. [22] (see also [28, §3.3]) Let Q be a Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n (resp. D_n) and $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantum affine algebra of type $A_n^{(1)}$ (resp. $D_n^{(1)}$). For any positive root β contained in Φ_n^+ associated to $\mathfrak{g}_0$, we set the $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V_Q(\beta)$ defined as follows:

$$V_Q(\beta) := V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p} \quad \text{where} \quad \phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (i, p). \tag{2.3}$$

We define the smallest abelian full subcategory $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ consisting of finite dimensional integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules such that

(a) it is stable by taking subquotient, tensor product and extension,
(b) it contains $V_Q(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$.

For the rest of this subsection, we briefly recall the morphisms between $U_q'(A_n^{(t)})$-modules $(t = 1, 2)$

$$V(\varpi_i)_a \otimes V(\varpi_j)_b \quad \text{and} \quad V(\varpi_k)_c.$$

These kinds of morphisms are known as *Dorey's type morphisms* and well-studied for the classical untwisted quantum affine algebras of types $A_n^{(1)}$, $B_n^{(1)}$, $C_n^{(1)}$ and $D_n^{(1)}$ in [14]. Recently, the author investigated such morphisms for the classical twisted quantum affine algebras of types $A_{2n-1}^{(2)}$, $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ and $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$ in [44].

Theorem 2.3. [14, Theorem 6.1] *Let $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ be the affine algebra of type $A_n^{(1)}$. For $1 \le i,j,k \le n$ and $a,b,c \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{U_q'(\mathfrak{g})}\big(V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^a} \otimes V(\varpi_j)_{(-q)^b}, V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^c}\big) \neq 0$$

if and only if one of the following holds:

(i) $i+j \le n$, $i+j=k$, $a-c=-j$ *and* $b-c=i$,
(ii) $i+j>n$, $k=i+j-n-1$, $c-a=-n-1+j$ *and* $b-a=n+1-i$.

In this paper, we denote the $D_3^{(2)}$ in [25] by $A_3^{(2)}$ with the following enumeration on Dynkin diagram:



Theorem 2.4. [44, Theorem 3.5, Theorem 3.9]

(a) *For $i+j=k \le n$, there exists a surjective $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$-module (resp. $U_q'(A_{2n}^{(2)})$-module) homomorphism*

$$p_{i,j}\colon V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^{-j}} \otimes V(\varpi_j)_{(-q)^i} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_k). \tag{2.4}$$

(b) *There exists a surjective $U_q'(A_{2n}^{(2)})$-module homomorphism*

$$p_{1,n}\colon V(\varpi_n)_{(-q)^{-1}} \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^n} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_n). \tag{2.5}$$

2.2. **The denominators of normalized R-matrices.** For good modules M and N, we have an *intertwiner* between $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules

$$R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}} : M_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes N_{\mathrm{aff}} \to \mathbf{k}(z_M, z_N) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}[z_M^{\pm 1}, z_N^{\pm 1}]} N_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes M_{\mathrm{aff}} \tag{2.6}$$

which satisfies

$$R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}} \circ z_M = z_M \circ R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}},\ R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}} \circ z_N = z_N \circ R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}} \ \text{ and } \ R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}}(\mathsf{v}_M \otimes \mathsf{v}_N) = \mathsf{v}_N \otimes \mathsf{v}_M.$$

Here M_{aff} is the *affinization* of M and z_M is the $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-automorphism of M_{aff} of weight δ. We call $R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}}$ the *normalized R-matrix*.

Note that

$$R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}}(M_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes N_{\mathrm{aff}}) \subset \mathbf{k}(z_N/z_M) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}[(z_N/z_M)^{\pm 1}]} (N_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes M_{\mathrm{aff}})$$

and there exists a unique monic polynomial $d_{M,N}(u) \in \mathbf{k}[u]$ such that

$$d_{M,N}(z_N/z_M) R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}}(M_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes N_{\mathrm{aff}}) \subset (N_{\mathrm{aff}} \otimes M_{\mathrm{aff}}). \tag{2.7}$$

We call $d_{M,N}(u)$ the *denominator* of $R_{M,N}^{\mathrm{norm}}$.

Theorem 2.5. [1, 35]

(1) *For good modules M_1 and M_2, the zeros of $d_{M_1,M_2}(z)$ belong to $\mathbb{C}[[q^{1/m}]]$ $q^{1/m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.*
(2) *$V(\varpi_i)_{a_i} \otimes V(\varpi_j)_{a_j}$ remains simple if and only if*

$$d_{i,j}(z) := d_{V(\varpi_i),V(\varpi_j)}(z)$$

does not have zeros at $z = a_i/a_j$ or a_j/a_i.
(3) *Let M be a finite dimensional simple integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module M. Then, there exists a finite sequence*

$$((i_1, a_1), \dots, (i_l, a_l)) \text{ in } (I_0 \times \mathbf{k}^\times)^l$$

such that $d_{i_k,i_{k'}}(a_{k'}/a_k) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq k < k' \leq l$ and M is isomorphic to the head of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^l V(\varpi_{i_k})_{a_k}$. Moreover, such a sequence $((i_1, a_1), \dots, (i_l, a_l))$ is unique up to permutation.

Thus the information on zeros of denominators between fundamental modules is crucial to investigate the finite dimensional integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules. The denominators between fundamental modules are calculated in [1, 16, 28, 44] for all classical quantum affine algebras.

Theorem 2.6. [16, 44] *For $1 \leq k, l \leq n$, we have*

$$d_{k,l}(z) = \prod_{s=1}^{\min(k,l,n+1-k,n+1-l)} (z - (-q)^{2s+|k-l|}) \qquad \text{if } \mathfrak{g} = A_n^{(1)}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$d_{k,l}(z) = \prod_{s=1}^{\min(k,l)} (z - (-q)^{2s+|k-l|})(z - (p^*)(-q)^{2s-k-l}) \text{ if } \mathfrak{g} = A_{2n-1}^{(2)} \text{ or } A_{2n}^{(2)}. \tag{2.9}$$

2.3. **Quiver Hecke algebras and their finite dimensional modules.** We now recall the definition of the quiver Hecke algebra. Let I be an index set and $\mathbf{k}$ be a field. For any symmetrizable Cartan datum $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$, $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) \in \mathbf{k}[u, v]$ $(i, j \in I)$ denote polynomials satisfying the following conditions:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) = \begin{cases} \sum_{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)p+(\alpha_j,\alpha_j)q=-2(\alpha_i,\alpha_j)} t_{i,j;p,q} u^p v^q & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

where $t_{i,j;p,q} = t_{j,i;q,p} \in \mathbf{k}$ and $t_{i,j;-a_{ij},0} \neq 0$. Thus we have $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) = \mathcal{Q}_{j,i}(v, u)$. Note that the symmetric group on m-letters, $\mathfrak{S}_m = \langle \mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{m-1} \rangle$, acts on I^m by place permutations.

Definition 2.7. [38, 39, 48] The *quiver Hecke algebra* $R(m)$ associated with polynomials $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v))_{i,j \in I}$ is the $\mathbb{Z}$-graded $\mathbf{k}$-algebra defined by three sets of generators

$$\{e(\nu) \mid \nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m) \in I^m\},\ \{x_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq m\},\ \{\tau_l \mid 1 \leq l \leq m-1\}$$

satisfying the following relations:

$$e(\nu)e(\nu') = \delta_{\nu,\nu'}e(\nu),\ \sum_{\nu\in I^m} e(\nu) = 1,\ x_k e(\nu) = e(\nu)x_k,\ x_k x_l = x_l x_k,$$

$$\tau_l e(\nu) = e(\mathfrak{s}_l(\nu))\tau_l,\ \tau_k\tau_l = \tau_l\tau_k \text{ if } |k-l|>1,\ \tau_k^2 e(\nu) = \mathcal{Q}_{\nu_k,\nu_{k+1}}(x_k, x_{k+1})e(\nu),$$

$$(\tau_k x_l - x_{\mathfrak{s}_k(l)}\tau_k)e(\nu) = \begin{cases} -e(\nu) & \text{if } l = k \text{ and } \nu_k = \nu_{k+1}, \\ e(\nu) & \text{if } l = k+1 \text{ and } \nu_k = \nu_{k+1}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$(\tau_{k+1}\tau_k\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k\tau_{k+1}\tau_k)e(\nu) = \delta_{\nu_k,\nu_{k+2}} \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\nu_k,\nu_{k+1}}(x_k, x_{k+1}) - \mathcal{Q}_{\nu_k,\nu_{k+1}}(x_{k+2}, x_{k+1})}{x_k - x_{k+2}} e(\nu).$$

By assigning $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on generator as below, $R(m)$ becomes $\mathbb{Z}$-graded:

$$\deg(e(\nu)) = 0, \quad \deg(x_k e(\nu)) = (\alpha_{\nu_k}, \alpha_{\nu_k}), \quad \deg(\tau_l e(\nu)) = -(\alpha_{\nu_l}, \alpha_{\nu_{l+1}}).$$

We denote the direct sum of the Grothendieck groups of the categories $\mathrm{Rep}(R(m))$ of finite dimensional graded $R(m)$-modules by

$$[\mathrm{Rep}(R)] = \bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} [\mathrm{Rep}(R(m))].$$

Note that $[\mathrm{Rep}(R)]$ has a free $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$-module structure induced from the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on $R(m)$, i.e. $(qM)_k = M_{k-1}$ for a graded module $M = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} M_k$.

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$R(m) \otimes R(n) \to R(m+n)$$

be the $\mathbf{k}$-algebra homomorphism given by $e(\mu)\otimes e(\nu) \mapsto e(\mu * \nu)$ $(\mu \in I^m, \nu \in I^n)$, $x_k \otimes 1 \mapsto x_k$ $(1 \leq k \leq m)$, $1 \otimes x_k \mapsto x_{m+k}$ $(1 \leq k \leq n)$, $\tau_k \otimes 1 \mapsto \tau_k$ $(1 \leq k < n)$, $1 \otimes \tau_k \mapsto \tau_{m+k}$ $(1 \leq k < n)$, where $\mu * \nu$ denotes the concatenation of μ and ν.

For an $R(m)$-module M and an $R(n)$-module N, the induced $R(m+n)$-module

$$M \circ N := R(m+n) \otimes_{R(m)\otimes R(n)} (M \otimes N)$$

is called the *convolution product of M and N* . For $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(m)$, $M_k \in \mathrm{Rep}(m_k)$ $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let

$$M^{\circ 0} = \mathbf{k}, \qquad M^{\circ r} = \underbrace{M \circ \cdots \circ M}_{r}, \qquad \mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{n} M_k = M_1 \circ \cdots \circ M_n.$$

For $\beta \in \mathsf{Q}^+$ with $|\beta| = m$, We define I^β and $e(\beta)$ as follows:

$$I^\beta = \{\nu = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_m) \in I^m \mid \alpha_{\nu_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{\nu_m} = \beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad e(\beta) = \sum_{\nu\in I^\beta} e(\nu).$$

Then $e(\beta)$ becomes a central idempotent. We define the subalgebra $R(\beta)$ of $R(m)$ by

$$R(\beta) := R(m)e(\beta)$$

and call it the *quiver Hecke algebra at* β.

Theorem 2.8. [38, 39, 48] *For any symmetrizable Cartan datum* $(\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$*, take* $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u,v))_{i,j\in I}$ *satisfying* (2.10)*. Then there exists an* $\mathbb{A}$*-algebra isomorphism*

$$U_{\mathbb{A}}^-(\mathfrak{g})^\vee \simeq [\mathrm{Rep}(R)]$$

where the multiplication of $[\mathrm{Rep}(R)]$ *is given by the convolution product.*

For a module M, We denote by $\mathrm{hd}(M)$ the *head* of M and $\mathrm{soc}(M)$ the *socle* of M, respectively.

Theorem 2.9. [12, Theorem 4.7][43, Theorem 3.1] (*see also* [37, 40]) *For a finite simple Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}_0$*, fix an equivalence class* $[\widetilde{w}_0]$ *of reduced expression of* w_0 *and take any reduced expression* $\widetilde{w}_0$ *in the class* $[\widetilde{w}_0]$*. We fix a convex total order* $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ *induced from the reduced expression* $\widetilde{w}_0$ (*see* (1.10))*.*

Let R *be the quiver Hecke algebra corresponding to* $\mathfrak{g}_0$*. For each positive root* $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$*, there exists a simple module* $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)$ *such that*

(a) *for all* $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*,* $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)^{\circ m}$ *is simple,*

(b) *for every* $\underline{m} = (m_1, \cdots, m_{\mathsf{N}}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$*, there exists a non-zero* R*-module homomorphism*

$$\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}} \colon \overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m}) := S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_1)^{\circ m_1} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_N)^{\circ m_N} \longrightarrow \overleftarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m}) := S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_N)^{\circ m_N} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_1)^{\circ m_1}.$$

and $\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}}) \simeq \mathrm{hd}\left(\overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\right) \simeq \mathrm{soc}\left(\overleftarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\right)$ *is simple.*

(c) *for every simple* R*-module* M*, there exists a unique sequence* $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$ *such that* $M \simeq \mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}}) \simeq \mathrm{hd}\big(\overrightarrow{S}_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\underline{m})\big)$*.*

(d) *for any minimal pair* (β_k, β_l) *of* $\beta_j = \beta_k + \beta_l$ *with respect to the convex total* $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$*, there exists an exact sequence*

$$0 \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_j) \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{\underline{m}}} S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k) \to S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_j) \to 0,$$

where $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\mathsf{N}}$ *such that* $m_k = m_l = 1$ *and* $m_i = 0$ *for all* $i \neq k, l$*.*

Remark 2.10. (i) In this paper, we use the module of $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)$ in [28]. Thus the statement (c) of the above theorem is different from [12, Theorem 2.9] even though we use the same convention $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0}$ for the convex total order induced from $\widetilde{w}_0$ (see. [28, Remark 4.3.3]).

(ii) For a minimal pair (β_k, β_l) of β_j with respect to $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$, the statement (d) of the above theorem tells that the modules $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l)$ and $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_l) \circ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta_k)$ have composition length 2.

(iii) For any pair of reduced expressions $\widetilde{w}_0$ and $\widetilde{w_0}'$ of w_0 which are adapted to Q, we have

$$S_{\widetilde{w}}(\beta) \simeq S_{\widetilde{w_0}'}(\beta) \quad \text{for all } \beta \in \Phi_n^+,$$

by (1.11) and Theorem 2.9 (d). Thus we denote by $S_Q(\beta)$ the simple $R(\beta)$-module $S_{\widetilde{w}_0}(\beta)$ for any reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ adapted to Q.

Definition 2.11. We say the quiver Hecke algebra $R(\beta)$ at β is *symmetric* if $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u,v)$ is a polynomial in $u-v$ for all $i,j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta)$. Here

$$\mathrm{supp}(\beta) := \{j \in I \mid a_j \neq 0 \text{ where } \beta = \sum_{j\in I} a_j\alpha_j\}.$$

2.4. **The generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functors.** Now we shortly review the generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functors which were studied in [27, 28].

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an index set and $\{V_s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ be a family of good $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules indexed by $\mathcal{S}$.

Assume that we have a triple (J, X, s) consisting of an index set J and two maps $X : J \to \mathbf{k}^\times$, $s : J \to \mathcal{S}$. For a given (J, X, s) and $\{V_s\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$, we define a quiver $Q^J = (Q_0^J, Q_1^J)$ by observing the order of zeros of denominator as follows:

(1) $Q_0^J = J$.

(2) For $i, j \in J$, we put $\mathtt{d}_{ij}$ many arrows from i to j, where $\mathtt{d}_{ij}$ is the order of the zero of $d_{V_{s(i)},V_{s(j)}}(z_2/z_1)$ at $X(j)/X(i)$.

For a quiver Q^J, we can associate

- a symmetric Cartan matrix $\mathsf{A}^J = (a_{ij}^J)_{i,j\in J}$ by

$$a_{ij}^J = 2 \quad \text{if } i = j, \quad a_{ij}^J = -\mathtt{d}_{ij} - \mathtt{d}_{ji} \quad \text{if } i \neq j, \tag{2.11}$$

- the set of polynomials $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^J(u,v))_{i,j\in I}$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^J(u,v) = (u-v)^{\mathtt{d}_{ij}}(v-u)^{\mathtt{d}_{ji}} \quad \text{if } i \neq j.$$

We denote by R_J the symmetric quiver Hecke algebra associated with $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}^J(u,v))_{i,j\in I}$.

Theorem 2.12. [27] *There exists a functor*

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathrm{Rep}(R_J) \to \mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

where $\mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ denotes the category of finite-dimensional integrable $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-modules. Moreover, the functor enjoys the following properties:

(a) *$\mathcal{F}$ is a tensor functor; that is, there exist $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$-module isomorphisms*

$$\mathcal{F}(R_J(0)) \simeq \mathbf{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}(M_1 \circ M_2) \simeq \mathcal{F}(M_1) \otimes \mathcal{F}(M_2)$$

for any $M_1, M_2 \in \mathrm{Rep}(R_J)$.

(b) *If the underlying graph of Q^J is a Dynkin diagram of finite type A, D or E, then the functor $\mathcal{F}$ is exact.*

We call the functor $\mathcal{F}$ the *generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality functor.*

Theorem 2.13. [28] *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be an affine Kac-Moody algebra of type $A_n^{(1)}$ (resp. $D_n^{(1)}$) and Q be a quiver whose underlying graph is a Dynkin diagram is of finite type A_n (resp. D_n). Set*

$$J := \{(i,p) \in \mathbb{Z}Q \mid \phi(i,p) \in \Pi_n \times \{0\}\},$$

where the map is given in (1.2)*. We define two maps $s : J \to \{V(\varpi_i) \mid i \in I_0\}$ and $X : J \to \mathbf{k}^\times$ as*

$$s(i,p) = V(\varpi_i) \quad \text{and} \quad X(i,p) = (-q)^p \quad \text{for } (i,p) \in J.$$

(a) *The underlying graph of the quiver Q^J associated to (J, X, s) is of finite type A_n (resp. D_n). Hence the functor*

$$\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)} : \mathrm{Rep}(R_J) \to \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$$

in Theorem 2.12 *is exact.*

(b) *The functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ sends simples to simples, bijectively. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ sends $S_Q(\beta)$ to $V_Q(\beta)$.*

Remark 2.14. In Theorem 4.9, we will provide an alternative proof of (a) in the above theorem by using *only* the results in this paper. In [28], the authors of [28] used the result of [22] to prove (a) in the above theorem.

3. Dorey's rules and minimal pair

In this section, we prove that Γ_Q encodes the information of the Dorey's type morphisms for $U_q'(A_n^{(1)})$, and all pair (α, β) of $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ are minimal with suitable convex total orders, which is compatible with respect to the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$.

Definition 3.1. Let β be a vertex in Γ_Q. (Equivalently, $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$.)

(a) The *upper ray of β* is the path consisting of one S-sectional path and one N-sectional path satisfying the following properties:

- $\underbrace{S_1 \to \cdots S_{a-1} \to S_a}_{S\text{-sectional path}} = \beta = \overbrace{N_b \to N_{b-1} \to N_1}^{N\text{-sectional path}}$,

- there is no vertex $S_0 \in \Gamma_Q$ such that $S_0 \to S_1$ is an S-sectional path in Γ_Q,
- there is no vertex $N_0 \in \Gamma_Q$ such that $N_1 \to N_0$ is an N-sectional path in Γ_Q.

(b) The *lower ray of* β is the path consisting of one S-sectional path and one N-sectional path satisfying the following properties:

- $\overbrace{N_1 \to \cdots N_{a-1} \to N_a}^{N\text{-sectional path}} = \beta = \underbrace{S_b \to S_{b-1} \to S_1}_{S\text{-sectional path}}$,
- there is no vertex $N_0 \in \Gamma_Q$ such that $N_0 \to N_1$ is an N-sectional path in Γ_Q,
- there is no vertex $S_0 \in \Gamma_Q$ such that $S_1 \to S_0$ is an S-sectional path in Γ_Q.

In Example 1.5, the upper ray and the lower ray of $[1,4]$ can be described as follows:



Theorem 3.2. *For every pair* (α, β) *of* $\alpha + \beta = \gamma \in \Phi_n^+$, *we write*

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) = i_\alpha, \quad \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = i_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) = i_\gamma.$$

Then we have

$$i_\alpha + i_\beta = i_\gamma \quad \text{or} \quad (n+1-i_\alpha) + (n+1-i_\beta) = (n+1-i_\gamma).$$

Proof. We write $\gamma = [a,b]$. By Corollary 1.13, the pair (α, β) is contained in the upper ray of $[a,b]$ or the lower ray of $[a,b]$. Assume that it is contained in the upper ray; that is, there exists $a \le c \le b$ such that $\alpha = [a,c]$ and $\beta = [c+1,b]$. Using (1.6), Theorem 1.11 and Remark 1.14, the situation in Γ_Q can be described as follows:



By Theorem 1.11 and Remark 1.14, $\kappa_u = [e,c]$ $(e \le c)$ and $\kappa_w = [c+1, f]$ $(c+1 \le f)$. Then Corollary 1.15 (a) tells that $w = u+1$ and hence $\ell = 1$. Thus we can conclude

$$i_\alpha = i_\gamma - i_\beta + 1 - \ell = i_\gamma - i_\beta$$

which implies our first assertion. If a pair (α, β) of $\gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ is contained in the lower ray of β_z, then one can prove our second assertion by applying a similar argument. □

Remark 3.3. Using the above theorem, we can observe the following: For pairs (α, β), (α', β') such that $\alpha + \beta = \alpha' + \beta' = \gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ and they are contained in the upper ray (resp. lower ray) of γ together, the number of edges between α and β in the upper ray (resp. lower ray) coincides with the one between α' and β'.

Now we show that every pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma \in \Phi_n^+$ is *indeed a minimal pair with respect to a suitable convex total order* compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$.

Theorem 3.4. *For every pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma$, there is a convex total order $<$ such that*

(a) *it is compatible with the convex partial order $\preceq_Q$,*
(b) *(α, β) is a minimal pair of γ with respect to the convex total order.*

Proof. As we observed, all pair (α, β) of γ is located in the upper ray of γ or lower ray of γ. Assume that (α, β) is in the upper ray. Take any pair (α', β') of γ.

(i) If (α', β') is also contained in the upper ray of γ, the observation in Remark 3.3 tells that we have one of the following two situations in Γ_Q:

Thus, with respect to the total convex order $<_Q^U$ in Remark 1.3, we have

$$\alpha <_Q^U \alpha' <_Q^U \gamma <_Q^U \beta <_Q^U \beta' \text{ or } \alpha' <_Q^U \alpha <_Q^U \gamma <_Q^U \beta' <_Q^U \beta.$$

(ii) Assume that (α', β') is contained in the lower ray of γ. Then the situation can be expressed as follows:



Hence, with respect to the total convex order $<_Q^U$ in Remark 1.3, we have

$$\alpha' <_Q^U \alpha <_Q^U \gamma <_Q^U \beta' <_Q^U \beta.$$

By (i) and (ii), we can conclude that every pair (α, β) in the upper ray becomes minimal with respect to the total convex order $<_Q^U$. In the similar way, one can see that every pair (α, β) in the lower ray becomes minimal with respect to the total convex order $<_Q^L$. □

For the rest of this paper, we say that *a pair* (α, β) *is minimal* when $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_n^+$ and the pair is a minimal pair with respect to a suitable convex total order which is induced by some reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ adapted to Q.

Corollary 3.5. (a) *For every pair* (α, β) *of* $\alpha + \beta = \gamma \in \Phi_n^+$, *we have a surjection*

$$S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{in } \mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n}). \tag{3.1}$$

Hence we have a surjection

$$V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\gamma) \quad \text{in } \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}. \tag{3.2}$$

(b) *For every positive root* $\beta \in \Phi_n^+$, *there exists a sequence* $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{|\beta|}) \in I_0^{|\beta|}$ *such that*

$$\bigotimes_{t=1}^{|\beta|} V_Q(\alpha_{i_t}) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\beta).$$

Proof. Note that for a minimal pair (α, β) of $\alpha + \beta = \gamma$ with respect to some convex total order $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0}$, Theorem 2.9 (d) guarantees the existence of (3.1) in $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$.

On the other hand, Theorem 3.4 tells that, for every pair (α, β) of γ, there exists a reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0'$ adapted to Q such that the pair is minimal with respect to the total order $\leq_{\widetilde{w}_0'}$. Thus our first assertion for $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$ follows.

Recall that the functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ sends simples to simples. Thus $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}\big(\mathrm{Im}(f)\big)$ is non-zero for any non-zero homomorphism f in $\mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$; i.e., $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ is faithful. Then our first assertion for $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$ follows since $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$ is a tensor functor sending $S_Q(\beta)$ to $V_Q(\beta)$. The existence of (3.2) is also guaranteed by Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 3.2.

The second assertion follows from the first assertion. □

From Corollary 3.5 (b), the condition (b) in Definition 2.2 can be modified as follows:

(b′) It contains $V_Q(\alpha_k)$ for all $\alpha_k \in \Pi_n$.

Corollary 3.6. *For* $\phi^{-1}(\alpha, 0) = (i, a), \phi^{-1}(\beta, 0) = (j, b)$, *assume that* $(k, c) \in \Gamma_Q$ *such that the triple* $\{(i, a), (j, b), (k, c)\}$ *satisfies the one of the condition* (i) *and* (ii) *in Theorem 2.3. Then we have*

$$\gamma := \phi(k, c) = \alpha + \beta.$$

Proof. By assumption, α, β are contained in the upper ray or lower ray of γ, respectively. Applying the argument in Theorem 3.2, one can prove the assertion. □

Recall Example 1.5.

(i) Using the reading in Remark 1.3 (A), the reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0$ of w_0 associated to the reading is

$$\widetilde{w}_0 = s_1s_3s_2s_1s_4s_3s_2s_1s_5s_4s_3s_2s_1s_5s_4$$

and the convex total order on Φ_5^+ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}[1] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [4]\\ <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [4,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,2] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2].\end{aligned}$$

With this convex total order, one can observe that every pair in lower rays becomes minimal.

(ii) Using the reading in Remark 1.3 (B), the reduced expression $\widetilde{w}_0'$ of w_0 associated to the reading is

$$\widetilde{w}_0' = s_3s_4s_5s_1s_2s_3s_4s_5s_1s_2s_3s_4s_1s_2s_1$$

and the convex total order on Φ_5^+ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}[3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [3,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [3,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [1] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [1,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [1,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [1,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [1,2]\\ <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [2,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [2,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [2,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [2] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [4,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0'} [5].\end{aligned}$$

With this convex total order, one can observe that every pair in upper rays becomes minimal.

Corollary 3.7. *For every pair (α,β) of $\alpha+\beta\in\Phi^+$,*

$$V_Q(\beta)\otimes V_Q(\alpha) \text{ and } S_Q(\beta)\circ S_Q(\alpha) \text{ are of length } 2.$$

Proof. Since every pair (α,β) is minimal, our assertions follow from Theorem 2.9 (d) and Theorem 2.13 (b). □

Remark 3.8. For a reduced expression of the longest element w_0 of A_5

$$\widetilde{w}_0 = s_1s_2s_3s_5s_4s_3s_1s_2s_3s_5s_4s_3s_1s_2s_3,$$

one can easily check that it is *not* adapted to any Dynkin quiver Q of type A_5. The convex total order induced by $\widetilde{w}_0$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}[1] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,2] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [4,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,5]\\ <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [2,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3,4] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3].\end{aligned}$$

Thus the pair $([1,2],[3,5])$ is not a minimal pair of $[1,5]$ with respect to $<_{\widetilde{w}_0}$, since we have

$$[1,2] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,3] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [1,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [4,5] <_{\widetilde{w}_0} [3,5].$$

One can compute that

$$S_{\widetilde{w}_0}([1,2]) = \mathsf{L}(21),\ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}([1,3]) = \mathsf{L}(321),\ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}([4,5]) = \mathsf{L}(45),\ S_{\widetilde{w}_0}([3,5]) = \mathsf{L}(345)$$

where $\mathsf{L}(21)$, $\mathsf{L}(321)$, $\mathsf{L}(45)$ and $\mathsf{L}(345)$ are 1-dimensional modules which are defined in the similar way of (4.1) below. Moreover, we have

- $\mathsf{L}(345)\circ\mathsf{L}(21)$ and $\mathsf{L}(45)\circ\mathsf{L}(321)$ have composition length 2,
- $\mathrm{hd}\big(\mathsf{L}(345)\circ\mathsf{L}(21)\big)\simeq\mathrm{soc}\big(\mathsf{L}(45)\circ\mathsf{L}(321)\big)$ are simple.

Hence we can conclude that

$$\mathrm{hd}\big(\mathsf{L}(345)\circ\mathsf{L}(21)\big)\not\simeq\mathrm{hd}\big(\mathsf{L}(45)\circ\mathsf{L}(321)\big)\simeq S_{\widetilde{w}_0}([1,5]),$$

by [29, Corollary 3.9].

4. Revisit of construction of exact sequences and simple modules.

In this section, we revisit the theories on construction of exact sequences and simple modules of R_{A_n} developed in [6, 12, 23, 28, 29, 32, 40, 43] by using the explicit description of Γ_Q in Section 1.

For a $\beta=[a,b]\in\Phi_n^+$, we define a 1-dimensional simple $R_{A_n}(\beta)$-module $L(a,b)=\mathbf{k}u(a,b)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&x_m u(a,b)=0\ (1\le m\le b-a+1),\\ &\tau_k u(a,b)=0\ (1\le k<b-a+1),\\ &e(\nu)u(a,b)=\begin{cases}u(a,b) & \text{if } \nu=(a,a+1,\dots,b),\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Fix a Dynkin quiver $\overleftarrow{Q}$ of type A_n, called the* linear quiver*, as follows:*

(4.2)



For $\beta=(a,b)\in\Phi_n^+$, we have

$$S_{\overleftarrow{Q}}(\beta)\simeq L(a,b).$$

Proof. By Lemma 1.7 (a), we have

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k,0)=(n,\xi_n-2(n-k))\quad\text{ for all } k\in I_0.$$

As is well-known, the shape of $\Gamma_{\overleftarrow{Q}}$ is given as follows:



For a simple root β, it is trivial. By an induction hypothesis on a height $|\beta|$ and Corollary 3.5, we have $(c+1,b) < (a,c)$ and a surjection

$$L(a,c) \circ L(c+1,b) \twoheadrightarrow S_{\overleftarrow{Q}}(\beta) \quad \text{for } \beta = (a,b) \in \Phi_n^+ \text{ with } |\beta| \geq 2.$$

Since there is a canonical surjection

$$L(a,c) \circ L(c+1,b) \twoheadrightarrow L(a,b),$$

and $L(a,c) \circ L(c+1,b)$ has a unique simple head, our assertion follows. □

Lemma 4.2. [32] *For $[a_1,b_1]$, $[a_2,b_2] \in \Phi_n^+$ with $a_1 = a_2$ or $b_1 = b_2$,*

$$L(a_1,b_1) \circ L(a_2,b_2) \simeq L(a_2,b_2) \circ L(a_1,b_1) \text{ is simple.}$$

Now the following proposition can be regarded as a generalization of the above lemma.

Proposition 4.3. *For any Dynkin quiver Q of type A_n and $\alpha = [a_1,b_1]$, $\beta = [a_2,b_2] \in \Phi_n^+$ with $a_1 = a_2$ or $b_1 = b_2$,*

$$S_Q(\alpha) \circ S_Q(\beta) \simeq S_Q(\beta) \circ S_Q(\alpha) \text{ is simple.}$$

Proof. By Remark 1.14, we have

$$|\phi_2^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta)| = |\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)|.$$

By (2.8) and Theorem 2.5, we have

$$V_Q(\alpha) \otimes V_Q(\beta) \simeq V_Q(\beta) \otimes V_Q(\alpha) \text{ is simple.}$$

Thus our assertion follows from Theorem 2.13. □

Corollary 4.4. *For any Dynkin quiver Q of type A_n and $\beta_k = [a_k,b_k] \in \Phi_n^+$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0})$, assume that $a_k = a_l$ (resp. $b_k = b_l$) for all $k \neq l$. Then we have*

$$S_Q(\beta_1) \circ S_Q(\beta_2) \circ \cdots \circ S_Q(\beta_k) \text{ is simple.}$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let Q be any Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n.*

(a) *For a source or a sink i in Q, and $a \le i \le b$,*

$$S_Q([a,i]) \circ S_Q([i,b]) \simeq S_Q([i,b]) \circ S_Q([a,i]) \text{ is simple.}$$

(b) *For a right intermediate or a left intermediate i in Q, and $a < i < b$*

$$S_Q([a,i]) \circ S_Q([i,b]) \text{ and } S_Q([i,b]) \circ S_Q([a,i]) \text{ are reducible.}$$

Proof. (a) Write $\phi^{-1}([i,b]) = (k,p)$ and $\phi^{-1}([a,i]) = (l,q)$. By Remark 1.14 (b-i) and (b-ii), we have

$$|k-l| \ge |p-q|.$$

Hence, by (2.8), $d_{k,l}(z)$ does not have a zero at $(-q)^{|p-q|}$. Thus

$$V_Q([a,i]) \otimes V_Q([i,b]) \simeq V_Q([i,b]) \otimes V_Q([a,i]) \text{ is simple,}$$

which yields our first assertion.
(b) Assume that i is a left intermediate. By Remark 1.14, all positive root of the form $[i,b]$ or $[a,i]$ are contained in the following hook in Γ_Q:

$$\overbrace{N_{n-i+1} \to \cdots N_2 \to N_1}^{\text{maximal } (N,i)\text{-sectional path}} = [i] = \underbrace{S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_i}_{\text{maximal } (S,i)\text{-sectional path}} .$$

Thus we can assume that $[i,b] = N_k$ $(2 \le k \le n-i+1)$ and $[a,i] = S_l$ $(2 \le l \le i)$. Then we have

$$\phi_1^{-1}(N_k) = k, \quad \phi_1^{-1}(S_l) = l \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2^{-1}(S_l) - \phi_2^{-1}(N_k) = k + l - 2.$$

In this case, one can check that

- $\min\{k, l, n+1-k, n+1-k\} = \min\{k,l\}$,
- $|k-l| + 2s = k + l - 2$ when $1 \le s = \min\{k,l\} - 1$.

Thus

$$V_Q([a,i]) \otimes V_Q([i,b]) \text{ and } V_Q([i,b]) \otimes V_Q([a,i]) \text{ are reducible,}$$

which yields our second assertion. The case for a right intermediate i, we can prove by applying the same argument. □

Corollary 4.6. *Let Q be Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n and i be a source or a sink in Q. For $\beta_k = [a_k, b_k] \in \Phi_n^+$ $(k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0})$, assume that $a_k = i$ or $b_k = i$ for all k. Then we have*

$$S_Q(\beta_1) \circ S_Q(\beta_2) \circ \cdots \circ S_Q(\beta_k) \text{ is simple.}$$

Lemma 4.7. [32] *For $[a_1,b_1]$, $[a_2,b_2] \in \Phi_n^+$ with $b_1 < a_2 - 1$,*

$$L(a_1,b_1) \circ L(a_2,b_2) \simeq L(a_2,b_2) \circ L(a_1,b_1) \text{ is simple.}$$

Now the following proposition can be regarded as a generalization of the above lemma.

Proposition 4.8. *For any Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A_n and $[a,b],[a',b'] \in \Phi_n^+$, assume that $a < b < a' - 1 < b'$. Then we have*

$$S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \simeq S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b]) \text{ is simple.}$$

Proof. Note that $[a,b'] \in \Phi_n^+$ and there is no $[a',b] \notin \Phi_n^+$. Thus

- $[a,b']$ is located at the intersection of the maximal (N,a)-sectional path and the maximal (S,b')-sectional path,
- there is no intersection between the maximal (S,a)-sectional path and the maximal (N,b')-sectional path.

Then the situations can be described as follows:



Write $\phi^{-1}([a,b]) = (i,p)$, $\phi^{-1}([a',b']) = (j,q)$ and $\phi^{-1}([a,b']) = (k,r)$. For the first and second cases, one can easily notice that $|i-j| > |p-q|$. Thus the assertion follows from (2.8).

Assume the third case. Then it is enough to show that, for any $1 \le s \le \min\{i, j, n+1-i, n+1-j\}$,

$$|i-j| + 2s \neq 2k - i - j. \tag{4.3}$$

Set $v = \max\{i,j\}$ and $w = \min\{i,j,n+1-i,n+1-j\}$. Then we have

$$|i-j| + 2s = 2k - i - j \quad \text{if } s = k - v.$$

However, the fact $k > i + j$ implies $k - v > w$. Thus the assertion holds. For the fourth case, one can prove by applying the similar argument of the third case. □

Now, we have an alternative proof of Theorem 2.13 (a) as we emphasized in Remark 2.14:

Theorem 4.9. *With the same choice of (J,X,s) in* Theorem 2.13*, the underlying graph of Q^J is of finite type A_n.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.5, there exists a surjective morphism

$$V_Q(\alpha_k) \otimes V_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) \quad \text{or} \quad V_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \otimes V_Q(\alpha_k) \twoheadrightarrow V_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1})$$

and hence $V_Q(\alpha_k) \otimes V_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$ is reducible.

On the other hand, Proposition 4.8 tells that

$$V_Q(\alpha_k) \otimes V_Q(\alpha_l) \simeq V_Q(\alpha_l) \otimes V_Q(\alpha_k) \text{ is simple for } |k-l| > 1.$$

By Theorem 2.5 and the fact that $d_{k,l}(z)$ in (2.8) has only zeros of multiplicity 1, our assertion follows. □

Definition 4.10. A simple $R(\beta_k)$-module M is called *real* if $M \circ M$ is again simple.

For example, every $S_Q(\beta)$ is real by Theorem 2.9 (a). Now, we recall one of the main results in [29]:

Theorem 4.11. [29] (*see also* [30]) *Let M_k be a simple $R(\beta_k)$-module $(k = 1, 2)$ and assume one of M_1 and M_2 is real, and $R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}(M_1),\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}(M_2)}(z)$ has a simple pole at $z = 1$. Then $M_1 \circ M_2$ has composition length 2. In particular, there exists an exact sequence*

$$0 \to N \to M_1 \circ M_2 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{M_1,M_2}} M_2 \circ M_1 \to N \to 0,$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{M_1,M_2}$ is non-zero, $\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{M_1,M_2})$ is the unique simple socle of $M_2 \circ M_1$ and N is the unique simple head of $M_2 \circ M_1$ (up to isomorphisms).

Note that the statements in the rest of this section also hold when we replace the module $S_Q(\beta)$ (resp. $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(R_{A_n})$) in the statements with $V_Q(\beta)$ (resp. $M \in \mathscr{C}_Q^{(1)}$), by applying the exact functor $\mathcal{F}_Q^{(1)}$.

Proposition 4.12. *Let Q be any Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n. Assume we have the following rectangle subquiver in Γ_Q:*



for $a \neq a'$ and $b \neq b'$. Then there exists a short exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \to S_Q([a,b']) \circ S_Q([a',b]) \\ \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b']) \to S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \to 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

such that $\mathbf{r} := \mathbf{r}_{S_Q([a,b']),S_Q([a',b])}$ and

- *$S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \simeq S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b])$ is simple,*
- *$S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b'])$ has composition length 2 with the unique simple socle $\mathrm{Im}(\mathbf{r})$ and the simple head $S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b])$ (up to isomorphisms).*

Proof. Write $\phi^{-1}([a',b]) = (j,q)$, $\phi^{-1}([a,b']) = (i,p)$, $\phi^{-1}([a,b]) = (k,r)$ and $\phi^{-1}([a',b']) = (l,s)$. In the rectangle subquiver, we can read that

$$|k-l| > |r-s| \text{ and hence } S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \simeq S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b]) \text{ is simple.}$$

Now we claim that $R^{\mathrm{norm}}_{V_Q([a',b]),V_Q([a,b'])}(z)$ has a pole at $z=1$; that is, there exists $1 \le t \le \min\{i, j, n+1-i, n+1-j\}$ satisfying

$$|i-j| + 2t = 2k - i - j. \tag{4.5}$$

Set $v = \max\{i,j\}$ and $u = \min\{i,j\}$. Then we have $w = \min\{u, n+1-v\}$ and

$$|i-j| + 2t = 2k - i - j \quad \text{if } t = k - v$$

Since $k \le i + j - 1$, $k - v < w$ always. Thus our claim holds.

By Theorem 4.11, it is enough to show that there exists a non-zero R-homomorphism

$$\psi : S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b']) \twoheadrightarrow S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']) \simeq S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b]).$$

Note that the following four cases can happen:

$$a < a' \le b' < b, \quad a' < a \le b < b', \quad a < a' \le b < b' \quad \text{or} \quad a' < a \le b' < b.$$

Let us consider the first case. From the rectangle quiver, we can read that $[a',b]$ is located at the right part of the upper ray of $[a',b]$ and hence $[b'+1,b]$ is located at the left part of the upper ray. Thus we have an injective R-homomorphism

$$S_Q([a',b]) \hookrightarrow S_Q([a',b']) \otimes S_Q([b'+1,b]). \tag{4.6}$$

By taking $- \circ S_Q([a,b'])$ to (4.6), we have a composition

$$\begin{aligned} S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b']) &\longrightarrow S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([b'+1,b]) \circ S_Q([a,b']) \\ &\longrightarrow S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b]), \end{aligned}$$

since $([b'+1,b],[a,b'])$ is the pair contained in the upper ray of $[a,b]$. By [29, Corollary 3.11], the composition is non-zero. From the fact that $S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b])$ is simple, the composition is surjective and hence $S_Q([a',b']) \circ S_Q([a,b])$ is a head of $S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b'])$. By applying the similar argument, one can see that there exists such a surjective homomorphism for the second case.

Now, we assume the third case; that is, $a < a' \le b < b'$. Since $([a,b],[b+1,b'])$ is the pair contained in the lower ray of $[a,b']$, we have an injective R-homomorphism

$$S_Q([a,b']) \hookrightarrow S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([b+1,b']). \tag{4.7}$$

By taking $S_Q([a',b]) \circ -$ to (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b']) &\longrightarrow S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([b+1,b']) \\ &\simeq S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b]) \circ S_Q([b+1,b']) \longrightarrow S_Q([a,b]) \circ S_Q([a',b']), \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 4.3. In the similar way, one can do for the fourth case, also. □

Remark 4.13. When Q is equal to $\overleftarrow{Q}$, we always have the following inequality in (4.4):

$$a' < a \leq b < b'.$$

Thus the above proposition can be understood as generalizations of the following statements [27, Proposition 4.2.3]:

(a) For $a' \leq a \leq b \leq b'$, $L(a,b) \circ L(a',b') \simeq L(a',b') \circ L(a,b)$ is simple.

(b) For $a' < a \leq b < b'$, there exists an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to L(a,b) \circ L(a',b') \to L(a,b') \circ L(a',b) \\ \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} L(a',b) \circ L(a,b') \to L(a,b) \circ L(a',b') \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the image of $\mathbf{r}$ coincides with the head of $L(a,b') \circ L(a',b)$ and the socle of $L(a',b) \circ L(a,b')$.

Theorem 1.11 tells that all positive roots β_k's in a maximal S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path ρ share second (resp. first) component and have the same value

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1^{-1}(\beta_k) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta_k) &= \phi_1^{-1}(\beta_{k'}) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta_{k'}) \\ (\text{resp. } \phi_1^{-1}(\beta_k) + \phi_2^{-1}(\beta_k) &= \phi_1^{-1}(\beta_{k'}) + \phi_2^{-1}(\beta_{k'})). \end{aligned}$$

For each maximal S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) path ρ, we assign a value

$$\chi_S(\rho) = \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) - \phi_2^{-1}(\beta) \text{ (resp. } \chi_N(\rho) = \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) + \phi_2^{-1}(\beta))$$

where β is any positive root in ρ.

Note that $\chi_S(\rho) \neq \chi_S(\rho')$ (resp. $\chi_N(\rho) \neq \chi_N(\rho')$) for any distinct pair of maximal S-sectional (resp. N-sectional) paths (ρ, ρ').

We set ρ_1 the maximal S-sectional path such that $\chi_S(\rho_1)$ is maximum and $\mathbf{i}_1$ the second component of ρ_1. In this way, we define ρ_k the maximal S-sectional path such that $\chi_S(\rho_k)$ is kth maximum and $\mathbf{i}_k$ the second component of ρ_k for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Similarly, we set ρ'_k the maximal N-sectional path such that $\chi_N(\rho'_k)$ is kth maximum and $\mathbf{j}_k$ the first component of ρ'_k for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

In Example 1.5,

$$(\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{i}_3, \mathbf{i}_4, \mathbf{i}_5) = (1,3,4,5,2) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{j}_1, \mathbf{j}_2, \mathbf{j}_3, \mathbf{j}_4, \mathbf{j}_5) = (3,1,2,4,5).$$

Theorem 4.14. *Let Q be any Dynkin quiver of finite type A_n. Assume that we have a simple R_{A_n}-module M.*

(a) *There exists a sequence*

$$(a_{1;\mathbf{i}_k}, a_{2;\mathbf{i}_k}, \dots, a_{\mathbf{i}_k-1;\mathbf{i}_k}, a_{\mathbf{i}_k;\mathbf{i}_k})$$

for $1 \le s \le \mathbf{i}_k$, $1 \le k \le n$ and $a_{s,\mathbf{i}_k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ such that

$$\mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{n} \left(\mathop{\circ}_{s=1}^{\mathbf{i}_k} S_Q\big([s, \mathbf{i}_k]\big)^{\circ a_{s;\mathbf{i}_k}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow M,$$

where $\mathop{\circ}_{s=1}^{\mathbf{i}_k} S_Q\big([s, \mathbf{i}_k]\big)^{\circ a_{s;\mathbf{i}_k}}$ is a simple module for every $1 \le k \le n$.

(b) *There exists a sequence*

$$(a_{\mathbf{j}_k;\mathbf{j}_k}, a_{\mathbf{j}_k;\mathbf{j}_k+1}, \dots, a_{\mathbf{j}_k;n-1}, a_{\mathbf{j}_k;n})$$

for $\mathbf{j}_k \le s \le n$, $1 \le k \le n$ and $a_{s,\mathbf{i}_k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ such that

$$\mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{n} \left(\mathop{\circ}_{s=\mathbf{j}_k}^{n} S_Q\big([\mathbf{j}_k, s]\big)^{\circ a_{\mathbf{j}_k;s}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow M,$$

where $\mathop{\circ}_{s=\mathbf{j}_k}^{n} S_Q\big([\mathbf{j}_k, s]\big)^{\circ a_{\mathbf{j}_k;s}}$ is a simple module for every $1 \le k \le n$.

Proof. With Theorem 1.11 and Theorem 2.9, our assertions come from the convex total orders $<_Q^U$, $<_Q^L$ and Proposition 4.3. □

Remark 4.15. Fix the Dynkin quiver as $\overleftarrow{Q}$. Then we have

$$(\mathbf{j}_1, \mathbf{j}_2, \dots, \mathbf{j}_{n-1}, \mathbf{j}_n) = (n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1).$$

(a) For a Kashiwara-Nakashima tableau T of shape λ of finite type A_n ([36]), we can associate $\ell(\lambda)$-tuple of partitions $(\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(\ell(\lambda)-1)}, \mu^{(\ell(\lambda))})$ as in [32, Section 1]. Here $\ell(\eta)$ denotes the length of a partition η. Set $L(a, b) = \mathbf{k}$ for $a > b$. Then [32, Theorem 4.8] tells that the simple head $\triangle(T)$ of

$$\nabla(T) := \mathop{\circ}_{k=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \left(\mathop{\circ}_{s=1}^{\ell(\mu^{(\ell(\lambda)+1-k)})} S_{\overleftarrow{Q}}\big([\ell(\lambda)+1-k, \ell(\lambda)+1-k+\mu_s^{(\ell(\lambda)+1-k)}-1]\big) \right)$$

is indeed a simple module over $R_{A_n}^{\lambda}$, the cyclotomic quotient of R_{A_n} with the dominant integral weight λ. Moreover, the crystal structure on $\{\triangle(T)\}$ ([42]) is isomorphic to the crystal structure of $B(\lambda)$ of $V(\lambda)$ over $U_q(A_n)$ ([33, 34]).

(b) If we give a total order on I_0 as $\mathbf{j}_k > \mathbf{j}_{k+1}$ for $1 \le k \le n-1$, we have

$$1 < 2 < \cdots < n-1 < n. \tag{4.8}$$

Then Lemma 4.1 tells that $S_{\overleftarrow{Q}}(\beta)$ coincides with the cuspidal representation L_β in [23, 40] with respect to the total order (4.8) on I_0.

5. The categories $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ over $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$ and $U_q'(A_{2n}^{(2)})$.

In this subsection, we study the category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ over $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$ and $U_q'(A_{2n}^{(2)})$ by using the combinatorial descriptions in Section 1 and the Dorey's type morphisms for $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$ and $U_q'(A_{2n}^{(2)})$ studied in [44].

Now, we fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ as $2n$ or $2n-1$, and a Dynkin quiver Q of finite type A_m. For $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $(-q)^p \in \mathbf{k}^\times$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \{1,\dots,n\} \ni i^\star &:= \begin{cases} i & \\ m+1-i & \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \\ ((-q)^p)^\star &:= \begin{cases} (-q)^p & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ (-1)^m(-q)^p & \text{if } n < i \leq m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Using (5.1), we can obtain an injective map $\star$, from the set $\left\{V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m,\ p \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$ consisting of fundamental $U_q'(A_m^{(1)})$-modules to the set $\left\{V(\varpi_i)_{\pm(-q)^p} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n,\ p \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$ consisting of fundamental $U_q'(A_m^{(2)})$-modules, which is given by (see [21])

$$(V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p})^\star := V(\varpi_{i^\star})_{((-q)^p)^\star}.$$

For each $(i,p) \in \Gamma_Q$ with $\phi(i,p) = (\beta, 0) \in \Phi_m^+ \times \{0\}$, we set

$$\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) := (V_Q(\beta))^\star = \begin{cases} V(\varpi_i)_{(-q)^p} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ V(\varpi_{m+1-i})_{(-1)^m(-q)^p} & \text{if } n < i \leq m, \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

which is a fundamental module over $U_q'(A_m^{(2)})$.

By mimicking Definition 2.2 and using (5.2), we can define the category $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ as follows (see also [21]):

Definition 5.1. Let Q be a Dynkin quiver of finite type A_m and $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantum affine algebra of type $A_m^{(2)}$ for $m = 2n$ or $2n-1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. We define the smallest abelian full subcategory $\mathscr{C}_Q^{(2)}$ consisting of finite dimensional integrable $U_q'(A_m^{(2)})$-modules such that

(a) it is stable by taking subquotient, tensor product and extension,
(b) it contains $\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_m^+$.

Here, Φ_m^+ is the set of positive root of A_m.

The goal of this subsection is to show the following theorem:

Theorem 5.2. *For every positive root $\gamma \in \Phi_m^+$ with $|\gamma| \geq 2$, there exists a minimal pair (α, β) such that there exists a surjective $U_q'(A_m^{(2)})$-module homomorphism*

$$\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\gamma).$$

It is known that ([1, (1.7)]), for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$V(\varpi_n)_{(-q)^p} \simeq V(\varpi_n)_{-(-q)^p} \tag{5.3}$$

where $V(\varpi_n)$ is a $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$-module.

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 5.2 *only for $m = 2n-1$. In the way of proving* Theorem 5.2 *for $m = 2n-1$, we use* (5.3) *several times. To prove the case when $m = 2n$, one has to use the same arguments, the same pairs of positive roots in this subsection, and use the morphism* (2.5) *instead of* (5.3).

Note that the p^* in (2.2) is $(-1)^m(-q)^{m+1}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = A_m^{(2)}$ ([44, Appendix A]).

Lemma 5.3. *For $\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}$ with $1 \leq k < 2n-1$, we have a surjective $U_q'(A_{2n-1}^{(2)})$-module homomorphism*

$$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k+\alpha_{k+1}) \text{ or } \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k+\alpha_{k+1}).$$

Proof. **(Case 1:**  **)** In this case, Lemma 1.7 (a) tells that

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k) = (k, \xi_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1}) = (2n-1-k, \xi_k - (2n-1)).$$

Thus, by Remark 1.14, we have $\alpha_k \prec_Q \alpha_{k+1}$,

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) = (2n-1, \xi_k - (2n-1-k))$$

and hence $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) = V(\varpi_1)_{-(-q)^{\xi_k-(2n-1-k)}}$. For each k, $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$ and $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$ are summarized by the following table:

k	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$
$k \leq n-1$	$V(\varpi_{k+1})_{-(-q)^{\xi_k-(2n-1)}}$	$V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^{\xi_k}}$
$k \geq n$	$V(\varpi_{2n-1-k})_{(-q)^{\xi_k-(2n-1)}}$	$V(\varpi_{2n-k})_{-(-q)^{\xi_k}}$

For $k \leq n-1$, we have an injection $V(\varpi_{k+1}) \rightarrowtail V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^k} \otimes V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^{-1}}$ by taking dual to (2.4). Tensoring the right dual of $V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^{-1}}$, we have

$$V(\varpi_{k+1}) \otimes V(\varpi_k)_{-(-q)^{2n-1}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^k},$$

which yields our assertion. Similarly, we can prove for $k \geq n$.

(Case 2: **)** In this case, we have

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k) = (k, \xi_k),\ \phi^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1}) = (1, \xi_k - 1 - k),\ \phi^{-1}(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) = (k+1, \xi_k - 1)$$

and hence $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) = V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{\xi_k - 1 - k}}$. For each k, $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$ and $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$ are summarized by the following table:

k	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1})$
$k \le n-1$	$V(\varpi_k)_{(-q)^{\xi_k}}$	$V(\varpi_{k+1})_{(-q)^{\xi_k - 1}}$
$k \ge n$	$V(\varpi_{2n-k})_{-(-q)^{\xi_k}}$	$V(\varpi_{2n-k-1})_{-(-q)^{\xi_k - 1}}$

Using the same technique in **(Case 1)**, we have $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1})$.
(Case 3:  **)** We have

$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k) = (2n-k, \xi_k - 2n + 2),\ \phi^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1}) = (k+1, \xi_k + 1),$$
$$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) = (1, \xi_k + 1 - k)$$

and hence $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}) = V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{\xi_k + 1 - k}}$. For each k, $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$ and $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$ are summarized by the following table:

k	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$	$\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1})$
$k \le n-1$	$V(\varpi_k)_{-(-q)^{\xi_k - 2n + 2}}$	$V(\varpi_{k+1})_{(-q)^{\xi_k + 1}}$
$k \ge n$	$V(\varpi_{2n-k})_{(-q)^{\xi_k - 2n + 2}}$	$V(\varpi_{2n-k-1})_{-(-q)^{\xi_k + 1}}$

By the same way of the **(Case 1,2)**, one can prove that $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{k+1}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1})$. For the remaining cases, we have

Q	$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k, 0)$	$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_{k+1}, 0)$	$\phi^{-1}(\alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1}, 0)$
	$(2n-k, \xi_k - 2n + 2)$	$(2n-1, \xi_k - 2n + k + 3)$	$(2n-k+1, \xi_k - 2n + 3)$
	$(1, \xi_k - k + 1)$	$(2n-k-1, \xi_k - 2n + 1)$	$(2n-k, \xi_k - 2n + 2)$
	$(1, \xi_k - k + 1)$	$(1, \xi_k - k - 1)$	$(2, \xi_k - k)$
	$(2n-1, \xi_k - 2n + 1 + k)$	$(k+1, \xi_k + 1)$	(k, ξ_k)
	$(2n-1, \xi_k - 2n + 1 + k)$	$(2n-1, \xi_k - 2n + 3 + k)$	$(2n-2, \xi_k - 2n + 2 + k)$

By using the same technique, one can prove our assertion for the remaining cases. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\gamma = [k,\ell] \in \Phi_n^+$ with $|\gamma| \geq 3$. We write the upper ray and the lower ray of $[k,\ell]$ as follows:*

$$\textit{Upper ray}: \underbrace{S_1^u \to \cdots S_{a_1-1}^u \to S_{a_1}^u}_{S\text{-sectional path}} = [k,\ell] = \overbrace{N_{b_1}^u \to N_{b_1-1}^u \to N_1^u}^{N\text{-sectional path}}$$

$$\textit{Lower ray}: \overbrace{N_1^l \to \cdots N_{b_2-1}^l \to N_{b_2}^l}^{N\text{-sectional path}} = [k,\ell] = \underbrace{S_{a_2}^l \to S_{a_2-1}^l \to S_1^l}_{S\text{-sectional path}}.$$

Then the followings hold:

(a) *If $a_1 = 1$ and $b_1 > 1$, then all N_j^l $(1 \leq j < b_2)$ are of the form $[k,t]$ with $t < \ell$ and all N_s^u $(1 \leq s < b_1)$ are of the form $[k,v]$ with $v > l$. Moreover, $N_{b_2-1}^l = [k,\ell-1]$ and the pair $([\ell],[k,\ell-1])$ is in the lower ray of γ.*

(b) *If $b_1 = 1$ and $a_1 > 1$, then all S_j^l $(1 \leq j < a_2)$ are of the form $[b,\ell]$ with $k < b$ and all S_s^u $(1 \leq s < a_1)$ are of the form $[a,\ell]$ with $a < k$. Moreover, $S_{b_2-1}^l = [k+1,\ell]$ and the pair $([k+1,\ell],[k])$ is in the lower ray of γ.*

(c) *If $a_2 = 1$ and $b_2 > 1$, then all N_j^u $(1 \leq j < b_1)$ are of the form $[k,t]$ with $t < \ell$ and all N_s^l $(1 \leq s < b_2)$ are of the form $[k,v]$ with $v > l$. Moreover, $N_{b_1-1}^u = [k,\ell-1]$ and $([\ell],[k,\ell-1])$ is in the upper ray of γ.*

(d) *If $b_2 = 1$ and $a_2 > 1$, then all S_j^u $(1 \leq j < a_1)$ are of the form $[b,\ell]$ with $k < b$ and all S_s^l $(1 \leq s < a_2)$ are of the form $[a,\ell]$ with $a < k$. Moreover, $S_{a_1-1}^u = [k+1,\ell]$ and the pair $([k+1,\ell],[k])$ is in the upper ray of γ.*

Proof. We only give a proof of (a). The remaining cases can be proved in the similar way. The second assertion of (a) follows from Theorem 1.11 and (1.15). In particular, $N_1^u \neq [k]$. Note that

$$N_1^l \to \cdots N_{b_2-1}^l \to N_{b_2}^l = N_{b_1}^u \to N_{b_1-1}^u \to N_1^u \text{ is a maximal } N\text{-sectional path.}$$

Thus by Proposition 1.10, $N_1^l = [k]$ and hence k is a sink or a right intermediate. On the other hand, $b_1 > 1$ implies that in Q. Hence $S_1^l = [\ell]$. Thus, by Remark 1.14, the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



Theorem 1.12 and Corollary 1.15 tell that for any $u < v < w$,

$$\sigma_u = [k, c], \quad \sigma_u = [e, f] \quad \text{and} \quad k \le c < e \le f < \ell.$$

By applying Theorem 1.12 once again, we can conclude that $N_j^l = [k, f]$ for $f < \ell$. Furthermore, we can observe that

$$\sigma_{w-1} = [g, \ell - 1] \ \text{ for some } \ g \le \ell - 1 \text{ and hence } \ N_{b_2-1}^l = [k, \ell - 1].$$

□

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\gamma = [k, \ell] \in \Phi_n^+$ with $|\gamma| \ge 3$.*

(a) *If there is no pair of γ in the upper ray, there exists a pair (α, β) in the lower ray such that*

$$|\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)| = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad |\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) - \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)| = 1.$$

(b) *If there is no pair of γ in the lower ray, there exists a pair (α, β) in the upper ray such that*

$$|\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) - \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)| = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad |\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) - \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)| = 1.$$

Proof. (a) Using the notations in Lemma 5.4, Corollary 1.12 implies that

$$N_1^l = [k] \quad \text{and} \quad S_1^l = [\ell] \quad \text{under the assumption of (a).}$$

Thus k can not be a source and a right intermediate in Q, and ℓ can not be a sink and a right intermediate in Q.

(Case 1: k is a sink and ℓ is a source) If $k = 1$ or $\ell = n$, then the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



For each case, $\sigma_2 = [2, a]$ and $\sigma_{s-1} = [b, n-1]$, respectively. Thus $(S_{a_2-1}^l = [2, \ell], [1])$ and $([n], N_{b_2-1}^l = [k, n-1])$ are desired ones, respectively.

If $k \neq 1$ and $\ell \neq n$, then Remark 1.14 and Corollary 1.15 imply that the situation in Γ_Q can be depicted as follows:



for some $k < b < c < a < \ell$. Thus $([k, b], [b + 1, \ell])$ is a pair in the upper ray of γ which yields a contradiction to the assumption.

(Case 2: k is a not sink or ℓ is not a source) Equivalently,



in Q.

Thus, using the notations in Lemma 5.4, the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



Then $(S^l_{a_2-1}, \sigma_{a+1}) = ([k+1, l], [k+1, c])$ and $(N^l_{b_2-1}, \sigma_{b-1}) = ([k, \ell-1], [d, \ell-1])$, respectively. Hence $([k + 1, \ell], [k])$ and $([\ell], [k, \ell - 1])$ are desired one, respectively. The proof for (b) can be obtained by applying the similar argument. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. For $\gamma \in \Phi^+_{2n-1}$ with $|\gamma| = 2$, it is already proved in Lemma 5.3. Thus it suffices to consider when $|\gamma| = |[k, \ell]| \geq 3$. To prove this, we need to observe the situation in Γ_Q for each case.

(Case 1: $1 < \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma) = i_\gamma \leq n$) (a) If there is a pair (α, β) in the upper ray, then Theorem 3.2 tells that

$$(\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha))^\star = \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \quad (\phi_1^{-1}(\beta))^\star = \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) + \phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = \phi_1^{-1}(\gamma).$$

Then we have a surjective homomorphism

$$\mathsf{V}_Q(\beta) \otimes \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\gamma)$$

by (2.4).

(b) Now we deal with the case when there is no pair in the upper ray. By Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, there exists a minimal pair (α, β) such that

$$(\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)) = (2n-1, i_\gamma + 1) \text{ or } (i_\gamma + 1, 2n-1).$$

For the case when $(\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)) = (2n-1, i_\gamma+1)$, it suffices to show that there exists a surjective homomorphism

$$V(\varpi_{(i_\gamma+1)^\star})_{((-q)^{p_\gamma-1})^\star} \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma+2n-1-i_\gamma}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_{i_\gamma})_{(-q)^{p_\gamma}}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $p_\gamma = \phi_2^{-1}(\gamma)$.
(b-i) If $i_\gamma < n$, then $(i_\gamma+1)^\star = i_\gamma + 1$ and $((-q)^{p_\gamma-1})^\star = (-q)^{p_\gamma-1}$. By taking dual to (2.4), we have

$$V(\varpi_{i_\gamma+1}) \rightarrowtail V(\varpi_{i_\gamma})_{(-q)^1} \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{-i_\gamma}}. \tag{5.5}$$

By taking the left dual of $V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{-i_\gamma}}$ to (5.5), we have

$$V(\varpi_{i_\gamma+1}) \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{-(-q)^{2n-i_\gamma}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_{i_\gamma})_{(-q)^1}.$$

Thus we have (5.4) for $i_\gamma < n$.
(b-ii) If $i_\gamma = n$, then $(i_\gamma+1)^\star = n-1$ and $((-q)^{p_\gamma-1})^\star = -(-q)^{p_\gamma-1}$. Then (5.4) becomes

$$V(\varpi_{n-1})_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma-1}} \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma+n-1}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_n)_{(-q)^{p_\gamma}} \simeq V(\varpi_n)_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma}},$$

by (5.3). The above equation follows from (2.4) directly.

The case when $(\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha), \phi_1^{-1}(\beta)) = (i_\gamma+1, 2n-1)$ can be proved in the same way.

(Case 2: $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta_\gamma) = 1$) Note that there is no pair in the upper ray. Thus using the notations in Lemma 5.4, we have

- $N_1^l = [k]$ and $S_1^l = [\ell]$,
- $[k] = N_1^l \to \cdots \to N_{b_2-1}^l \to N_{b_2}^l$ is a maximal N-sectional path,
- $S_{a_2}^l \to S_{a_2-1}^l \to \cdots \to S_1^l = [\ell]$ is a maximal S-sectional path.

Thus the situation in Γ_Q can be drawn as follows:



for some $a < k$ and $\ell < b$. By Corollary 1.15, $\sigma_{t-1} = [c, \ell-1]$ $(c \le \ell-1)$ and hence $N^l_{s-1} = [k, \ell-1]$. We fix a pair (α, β) as $([\ell], [k, \ell-1])$. Then we can see that

$$\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) = 2n+1-i_\alpha \text{ and } (2n-\phi_1^{-1}(\beta)) + (2n-\phi_1^{-1}(\alpha)) = (2n-\phi_1^{-1}(\gamma)) = 2n-1.$$

(a) Assume that $i_\alpha = \phi_1^{-1}(\alpha) \ge n+1$, then $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \le n$. Thus it suffices to show that there exists a surjective homomorphism

$$V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha+1})_{(-q)^{p_\gamma-2n+i_\alpha}} \otimes V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha})_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma+i_\alpha-1}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{p_\gamma}}. \tag{5.6}$$

By taking dual to (2.4), we have

$$V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha+1}) \rightarrowtail V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{2n-i_\alpha}} \otimes V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha})_{(-q)^{-1}}. \tag{5.7}$$

By taking left dual of $V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha})_{(-q)^{-1}}$ to (5.7), we have

$$V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha+1}) \otimes V(\varpi_{2n-i_\alpha})_{-(-q)^{2n-1}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{2n-i_\alpha}}.$$

Thus we have (5.6) for $i_\alpha \ge n+1$.
(b) Assume that $i_\alpha \le n$, then $\phi_1^{-1}(\beta) \ge n+1$. Thus it suffices to show that there exists a surjective homomorphism

$$V(\varpi_{i_\alpha-1})_{-(-q)^{p_\gamma-2n+i_\alpha}} \otimes V(\varpi_{i_\alpha})_{(-q)^{p_\gamma+i_\alpha-1}} \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{p_\gamma}}. \tag{5.8}$$

By taking dual to (2.4), we have

$$V(\varpi_{i_\alpha}) \rightarrowtail V(\varpi_{i_\alpha-1})_{(-q)^1} \otimes V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{-i_\alpha+1}}.$$

By taking right dual of $V(\varpi_{i_\alpha-1})_{(-q)^1}$, we have

$$V(\varpi_{i_\alpha-1})_{-(-q)^{-2n+1}} \otimes V(\varpi_{i_\alpha}) \twoheadrightarrow V(\varpi_1)_{(-q)^{-i_\alpha+1}}.$$

Thus we have (5.8) for $i_\alpha \le n$.

The remaining case **(Case 3:** $n < \phi_1^{-1}(\beta_\gamma) = i_\gamma \le 2n-1$**)** can be proved by applying the similar arguments in **(Case 1)** and **(Case 2)**.

Corollary 5.6. *For every positive root $\beta \in \Phi^+_m$, there exists a sequence $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{|\beta|}) \in I_0^{|\beta|}$ such that*

$$\bigotimes_{t=1}^{|\beta|} \mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_{i_t}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathsf{V}_Q(\beta).$$

From Corollary 5.6, the condition (b) in Definition 5.1 can be also restated as follows:

(b′) It contains $\mathsf{V}_Q(\alpha_k)$ for all $\alpha_k \in \Pi_m$.

References

1. T. Akasaka and M. Kashiwara, *Finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Publ. RIMS. Kyoto Univ., **33** (1997), 839-867.
2. S. Ariki, *On the decomposition numbers of the Hecke algebra of $G(M, 1, n)$*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **36** (1996), 789-808.
3. M. Auslander, I. Reiten and S. Smalo, *Representation theory of Artin algebras*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics **36**, Cambridge 1995.
4. I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowroński, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol.1*, London Math. Soc. Student Texts **65**, Cambridge 2006.
5. R. Bedard, *On commutation classes of reduced words in Weyl groups*, European J. Combin. **20** (1999), 483–505.
6. G. Benkart, S.-J. Kang, S.-j. Oh, and E. Park, *Construction of Irreducible representations over Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras of finite classical type*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **5** (2014) 1312–1366.
7. A. Berenstein, S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, *Parameterizations of canonical bases and totally positive matrices*, Adv. Math. **122** (1996), 49–149.
8. N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXIV. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitres IV–VI.* Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1337. Hermann, Paris, 1968.
9. S. Brenner, *A combinatorial characterisation of finite Auslander-Reiten quivers. In: Representation Theory I. Finite Dimensional Algebras* (ed. V. Dlab, P. Gabriel, G. Michler). Springer LNM 1177 (1986), 13-49.
10. J. Brundan and A. Kleshchev, *Blocks of cyclotomic Hecke algebras and Khovanov-Lauda algebras*, Invent. Math., **178** (2009) 451–484.
11. ———, *Graded decomposition numbers for cyclotomic hecke algebras*, Adv. Math. **222** (2009), no. 6, 1883–1942.
12. J. Brundan, A. Kleshchev and P. J. McNamara, *Homological properties of finite Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Duke Math. J., **163** (2014), 1353–1404.
13. A. Buan, R. Marsh, M. Reineke, I. Reiten and G. Todorov, *Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics*, Adv. Math. **204** (2006), no, 2, 572–618.
14. V. Chari and A. Pressley, *Yangians, integrable quantum systems and Dorey's rule*, Comm. Math. Phys. **181** (1996), no. 2, 265-302.
15. I. V. Cherednik, *A new interpretation of Gelfand-Tzetlin bases*, Duke Math. J., **54** (1987), 563–577.
16. E. Date and M. Okado, *Calculation of excitation spectra of the spin model related with the vector representation of the quantized affine algebra of type $A_n^{(1)}$*, Internat. J. Modern Phys. A **9** (3) (1994), 399–417.
17. E. Frenkel and E. Mukhin, *Combinatorics of q-characters of finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Commun. Math. phys. **216** (2001), 23–57.
18. P. Gabriel, *Auslander-Reiten sequences and Representation-finite algebras*, Lecture notes in Math., vol. 831, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1980, pp.1.71.
19. V. Ginzburg , N. Reshetikhin and E. Vasserot, *Quantum groups and flag varieties*, A.M.S. Contemp. Math. **175** (1994), 101-130.
20. D. Happel, *Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes 119, Cambridge 1988.
21. D. Hernandez, *Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture: the general case*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2010 (1) (2010), 149–193.

22. D. Hernandez and B. Leclerc, *Quantum Grothendieck rings and derived Hall algebras*, arXiv:1109.0862v2 [math.QA], to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.
23. D. Hill, G. Melvin and D. Mondragon, *Representations of quiver Hecke algebras via Lyndon bases*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **216** (2012), no. 5, 1052–1079.
24. J. Hu and A. Mathas, *Graded cellular bases for the cyclotomic Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras of type A*, Adv. Math. **225** (2010), no. 2, 598–642.
25. V. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, 3rd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
26. S.-J. Kang and M. Kashiwara, *Categorification of highest weight modules via Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Invent. Math. **190** (2012), 699–742.
27. S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara and M. Kim, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras*, arXiv:1304.0323 [math.RT].
28. ———, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras II*, arXiv:1308.0651 [math.RT], to appear in Duke Math. J.
29. S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, M. Kim and S.-j. Oh, *Simplicity of heads and socles of tensor products*, Compos. Math. **151** (2015), no. 2, 377–396.
30. ———, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras IV*, arXiv:1502.07415 [math.RT].
31. S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara and S.-j. Oh, *Supercategorification of quantum Kac-Moody Algebras*, Adv. Math. **242** (2013) 116–162.
32. S.-J. Kang and E. Park, *Irreducible modules over Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras of type A_n and semistandard tableaux*, J. Algebra **339** (2011), 223–251.
33. M. Kashiwara, *On crystal bases of the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), no. 2, 465–516.
34. ———, *The crystal base and Littelmann's refined Demazure character formula*, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), no. 3, 839–858.
35. ———, *On level zero representations of quantum affine algebras*, Duke. Math. J. **112** (2002), 117–175.
36. M. Kashiwara and T. Nakashima, *Crystal graphs for representations of the q-analogue of classical Lie algebras*, J. Algebra **165** (1994), no. 2, 295–345.
37. S. Kato, *Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt bases and Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Duke Math. J. **163**, 3 (2014), 619–663.
38. M. Khovanov and A. D. Lauda, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups I*, Represent. Theory **13** (2009), 309–347.
39. ———, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 5, 2685–2700.
40. A. Kleshchev and A. Ram, *Representations of Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras and combinatorics of Lyndon words*, Math. Ann. **349** (2011), no. 4, 943–975.
41. A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc and J.-Y. Thibon, *Hecke algebras at roots of unity and crystal bases of quantum affine algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **181** (1996), 205-263.
42. A. Lauda and M. Vazirani, *Crystals from categorified quantum groups*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 2, 803–861.
43. P. McNamara, *Finite dimensional representations of Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras I: finite type*, to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.; arXiv:1207.5860.

44. S-j. Oh, *The Denominators of normalized R-matrices of types* $A^{(2)}_{2n-1}$, $A^{(2)}_{2n}$, $B^{(1)}_n$ *and* $D^{(2)}_{n+1}$, arXiv:1404.6715 [math.QA].
45. ———, *Auslander-Reiten quiver of type D and generalized quantum affine Schur-Weyl duality*, arXiv:1406.4555 [math.RT].
46. P. Papi, *A characterization of a special ordering in a root system*, Proc. Amer. Math. **120** (1994), 661–665.
47. C. Ringel, *PBW-bases of quantum groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **470** (1996), pp. 51–88.
48. R. Rouquier, *2 Kac-Moody algebras*, arXiv:0812.5023 (2008).
49. M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot, *Canonical bases and KLR algebras*, J. reine angew. Math. **659** (2011), 67–100.

School of Mathematics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study Seoul 130-722, Korea
E-mail address: sejin092@gmail.com